DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 202 EC 230 832

TITLE Exemplary Supported Employment Practices. NARF Technical Assistance Series.
INSTITUTION National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 89
GRANT G008745415
NOTE 91p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, P.O. Box 17675, Washington, DC 20041 ($3.50 members; $6.50 nonmembers).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Demonstration Programs; *Disabilities; *Employment Programs; Human Services; Job Placement; Postsecondary Education; *Program Evaluation; Quality of Life; *Rehabilitation Programs; Social Integration; *Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS *Supported Employment Programs

ABSTRACT

This booklet gathers and discusses best practices for supported employment in rehabilitative facilities. The first chapter reviews the need to identify best practices and examines such issues as jobs, integration, and quality of life. The second chapter describes eight programs chosen as exemplary, providing data on program goals, average wage and hour conditions of program placements, philosophical orientation, staff, clients, funding, and strengths. The third chapter offers conclusions, discussing 32 common practices found to be effective in the chosen programs. Twenty-eight references are included, and appendices describe methodology, including the Supported Employment Quality Indicators Profile. (PB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED318202

# *Exemplary Supported Employment Practices*

November 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dr. Christine Mason
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities
Washington, D.C.

EC 230832

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Exemplary Supported Employment Practices

National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities

P.O. Box 17675
Washington, D.C. 20041

Project Funded by the Office of Special Education and
Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education
No. G00874515

© National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, 1989.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| Foreward | | i |
| Acknowledgments | | ii |
| Chapter 1 | The Issues and Need to Identify Exemplary Practices | 1 |
| Chapter 2 | Exemplary Practices: Descriptions of the Eight Selected Programs | 5 |
| Chapter 3 | Conclusions | 37 |
| References | | 48 |
| Appendix A | Methods | 51 |
| Appendix B | NARF's Supported Employment Quality Indicators Profile | |
| Appendix C | Evaluation and Data Forms | |

## FOREWORD

NARF's National Scope Supported Employment Demonstration Project is now in its third year of operation and is providing technical assistance to the field. This publication is the first of a new series which NARF is pleased to bring to you. And what better way to start NARF's Technical Assistance Series than to focus on quality and exemplary practices?

The National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities stands firm in its belief that quality can be promoted through networking and sharing information and resources. The wide variety of practices which contribute to positive outcomes for persons with disabilities are evident in the descriptions for the eight projects which NARF reviewed. However, quality is constantly evolving as conditions change and wisdom acquired.

The rehabilitation field needs to position "quality" as both the foundation for growth and the benchmark of success. Rehabilitation consumers, both individuals with disabilities and employers, rely on rehabilitation providers to provide quality services, thereby enhancing outcomes for each. NARF also strives to provide quality information expeditiously to the field. As we approach the end of 1989 and look toward the decade leading into the 21st century, let us each work toward a vision. NARF's vision is that quality services will mean better lives for all and that NARF's research, networking, legislative efforts, and information dissemination will assist in achieving these quality outcomes. NARF's vision is "quality through quality" -- quality efforts resulting in quality outcomes. Exemplary Supported Employment Practices is one step toward a better future. The next step depends on you...and you...and you....and all of us, working together, for quality.

John A. Doyle
Executive Director

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many persons have assisted with the completion of the National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities' **Exemplary Supported Employment Practices** publication. First and foremost, thanks needs to go to all of the programs which responded to the call for nominations. The widespread participation from the field provided assurance that the outcomes were at least representative of practices during 1989.

A special thanks also ....

...to the exemplary programs visited and the people there who made the visits possible: Caroline Redpath of ARC of Palm Beach County; Marcie Deminstein of Community Mental Health Affiliates, Inc.; Karla Nabors and Pat Juhrs of CSAAC; Kay Holjes of Employment Opportunities, Inc.; Bill Hewitt of Dallas Epilepsy Association; Karen Ward of ASETS; Mary Jo Snell of AVATRAC; and Carolyn Parker and Rick Phelps of the Clayton County Work Rehabilitation Center. Their willingness to assist the site reviewers as they interviewed staff, employers, and consumers; observed sites; and reviewed records is especially appreciated.

...to consultants, who not only served as a part of the site review team, but also assisted in the review of the narratives included in this document: Janet Samuelson of Brevard Achievement Center in Florida; Dena Cosgrove of the Rehabilitation Center in Connecticut; Sharon Smith of WORK, Inc. in Massachusetts; Bob Hofmann of the Maryland Rehabilitation and Employment Association in Maryland; Rick Phelps of Clayton County Work Rehabilitation Center in Georgia; Cary Griffin of Colorado Technical Assistance and Training; Gary Cook of Occupational Center of Central Kansas, Inc. and chair of NARF's Supported Employment Task Force; Russ Cusak of the Alaska Department of Vocational Rehabilitation; and Ann Noll, a private consultant in Florida. These people gave much of their time and energy.

...to the Supported Employment Advisory Council members for their input in design of the process, the criteria, and the Supported Employment Profile; Traci Register for her word processing, editing, and proofreading efforts; and all other support staff involved in the creation of this publication.

... to the other professionals involved in the review end editing of this document: Dr. Bob Schalock, Rick Phelps, Karen Wolf-Branigan, Dr. Bill Wolk, Karen Machusic, Gary Cook, and Janet Samuelson.

The success of this project thus far has been furthered by many collaborative efforts, I look forward to continued collaboration during the remainder of this project and in the years to come.

Christine Y. Mason, Ph.D.
Director, Community
Employment Projects

## Chapter 1

## THE ISSUES AND NEED TO IDENTIFY BEST PRACTICES

Supported employment is improving many aspects of the quality of life for many individuals with disabilities (NARF, 1989; Wehman, Kregel, & Shafer, 1989). Average wages with supported employment appear to be at or slightly above minimum wage and most supported employees are integrated during all work hours, including lunch and breaks. NARF's survey of 2,034 potential supported employment providers (NARF, 1989) also found that 75% of supported employment services are provided by traditional rehabilitation facilities, facilities also providing sheltered and competitive employment.

Supported employment is being offered by agencies varying dramatically in size, orientation, and structure. Many providers are operating with budgets over three million and responsibilities for a host of services including preschool, developmental, residential, transitional, and vocational services. Most providers experienced rapid expansion of their supported employment programs these past few years and predictions are that this rapid expansion will continue (NARF, 1989; Wehman et al., 1989).

### Issues

#### Jobs

Opportunities 2000 (Hudson Institute, 1988) includes an analysis of demographic and human resource needs which will impact employment and workforce capacity in the United States at the start of the 21st century. That report describes trends which will impact community employment of persons with disabilities, including the aging of the workforce, with a reduction in the number of young employees entering the workforce, and an increase in women and minorities in the workforce. Technology also has impacted workforce needs, creating a need for more highly skilled workers who can adapt to technological improvements. Predictions are that most of the new jobs will be in the service and information areas, with fewer jobs in manufacturing.

Job development for persons in supported employment has been furthered by many recent activities such as the marketing plan implemented by the Administration on Developmental Disabilities (Kiernan, Sanchez, & Schalock, 1989). This plan targeted industries with high turnover rates during the first year, expanded the market the second year, and used a pledge-card system to designate a certain number of jobs available to individuals with disabilities. Food and beverage preparation was the largest job area with 23% of the jobs, food and beverage services followed at 17%, building services jobs were 8%, and fabrication and assembly accounted for 5%.

**Types of Approach**

Most data indicate that the best wage, hour, and integration outcomes are being achieved with the individual placement model. Some states have even taken a philosophical stance and only are funding through Title VI-C the individual placement model of supported employment (Pennsylvania). There may be valid reasons for such an effort. Other feedback from agencies on such concerns as cost effectiveness to providers, local job availability and unemployment rates, and the role of rehabilitation facilities in certain rural areas indicate, however, that such actions may be premature. For example, some rehabilitation facilities report they are the primary employers for their community. Limiting approaches to supported employment may inhibit expansion of trial implementation and thus decrease access to the very outcomes supported employment is trying to achieve.

**Integration**

In terms of outcomes achieved with supported employment, the field also is beginning to summarize a fuller picture of the type and value of integration that is occurring. A study by Chadsey-Rusch, Gonzales, Tines, and Johnson (1989) evaluated the social interaction of individuals with and without mental retardation in integrated work settings. Individuals were observed five times during four repeated time periods (during both break and work times) and the authors reported that: (1) individuals are more likely to interact with coworkers than work supervisors; (2) coworkers without disabilities tended to interact more frequently with other coworkers without disabilities; (3) coworkers without disabilities tended to engage in significantly less nontask interactions with workers with mental retardation; and (4) handicapped workers were more likely to socialize out of work with other handicapped workers.

Storey and Knutson (1989) also analyzed workplace interactions of employees with and without disabilities for fifteen minutes per day over a ten day period of time. Interactions were coded according to receiving, providing, or requesting: assistance, instruction, criticism, social amenities, personal or work conversation, compliments, or teasing/provocation, or demonstrating unacceptable or job-engaged behaviors. For their pilot project, the authors reported wide variations in the amount and type of social interactions; however, generally workers without disabilities tended to interact more with coworkers and customers, while workers with disabilities interacted more with their school or agency supervisors. Workers without disabilities also tended to engage in more work and personal conversation than did the employees with disabilities.

Despite the success as measured by gross indicators (wages, hours worked, benefits), the tangible results of physical integration are less positive, providing rehabilitation agencies, advocates, and consumers with fewer reasons for optimism. While supported employment increases opportunities for interactions between individuals with and without disabilities, such interactions may or may not enhance the status of an individual or add to his/her overall quality of life.

## Quality of Life

Research on life and work satisfaction of non-handicapped persons (Hackman & Suttle, 1977) indicates that social integration, growth and security, the development of human capacities, the total life space, social relevance of work, adequate and fair compensation, and safe and healthy environments all contribute to one's quality of life. One attempt to develop a measurement of quality of life for individuals with disabilities has involved field testing the Quality of Life Questionnaire (Keith, Shalock, & Hoffman, 1986) with over 500 persons with and without disabilities in the United States, Israel, Germany, and Australia. From that field testing, four quality of life factors have emerged empirically: satisfaction, competence/productivity, empowerment/independence, and social belonging/community integration.

Many of the key components to an adequate quality of life appear to be summarized in a report to Canada, "3,300,000 Canadians (Standing committee on the status of Disabled persons, 1988). In that report, Fred Morgan, a member of the Canadian Association for Community Living's National Task Force on employment and a father of a child with intellectual handicaps stated:

> What do all people need in life? They need to be challenged. They need to feel self-worth. They need to feel self-accomplishment. They need to gain recognition for their skills earned. They need to contribute to society. They need to earn a living and to gain independence. (p.22).

While wages and community presence have been improved with supported employment, benefits and hours worked remain more frustrating dilemmas, with most supported employees working less than full time and many receiving only minimum benefits such as paid holidays and sick leave. Medical insurance and retirement plans have been more difficult to access. This is hardly surprising since many supported employees are working in entry level jobs where hours and benefits are of concern to all such employees. Additionally, SSI/SSDI requirements remain disincentives for many, and fatigue also is a factor in hours worked; however, further analysis is needed to determine how frequently the need for limited hours is based on individual health and skills rather than attitudinal and other barriers.

Does supported employment foster improvements in quality of living for individuals with disabilities? Is so, how is this best achieved? Which factors result in best outcomes?

## The Need to Identify Exemplary Practices

Philosophical controversies as well as data on the state-of-the-art for supported employment have substantiated the need for further information not only concerning supported employment outcomes and procedures, but also

information on best practices. Accordingly, NARF Supported Employment staff in 1988 set out to compare results and practices and ultimately to identify exemplary practices. While the present publication cannot be termed a catalog of the best supported employment programs in the country, this publication does include descriptions of the supported employment programs for some of the agencies obtaining the best outcomes for people with disabilities, according to the following criteria:

1. These data represent programs serving individuals with severe disabilities.

2. The data represent some of the best outcomes: wages, benefits, hours worked, and level of integration.

3. The data represent outcomes obtained under diverse circumstances (varying locations, agency structure, strengths, and barriers).

4. The data represent programs serving individuals with a variety of disabilities: developmental disabilities, mental retardation, autism, serious behavior disorders, epilepsy, and chronic mental illness.

While many attempts were made to obtain the best available information on quality practices, given the nomination process and the rapid growth of supported employment, no assurance can be made that the best supported employment programs are represented in this publication. However, continued comparisons with the programs identified as exemplary (J.M. Foundation, 1988; Backer, 1987; Rehabilitation Network of New England, 1988) indicate that the data are representative of the results of the best rehabilitation practices at this point in time.

In introducing this publication, a final rationale for focusing on quality and exemplary practices comes from requests NARF has had to describe best practices and advise programs on how to enter into and expand supported employment services. Therefore, the primary purposes of this publication are to present information on: (1) some of the best outcomes for persons with severe disabilities, and (2) the conditions under which these outcomes were achieved.

## Chapter 2

### EXEMPLARY PRACTICES: DESCRIPTIONS OF THE EIGHT SELECTED PROGRAMS

Eight visits to sites selected for their exemplary outcomes were conducted between May and August, 1989. Composite results from data obtained through record reviews; staff, employer, consumer, and professional interviews; observations of supported employment programs; and project literature are described in this chapter. Detailed descriptions of procedures used are available in Appendix A (Methods) and Appendix B (the NARF Supported Employment Quality Indicators Profile).

A surprising outcome has been the recognition that despite careful attention to outcomes, not all projects currently meet the strict federal definition and regulations for Supported Employment as described in the Title VI, Part C of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (P.L. 99-506) and accompanying regulations. However, this outcome is consistent with the controversy Kregel (1985) describes regarding the "appropriateness of the Title VI-C regulations." (p. 131).

The programs reviewed deviated from federal guidelines in the following ways:

1. Use of enclaves as transitional sites.

2. Excellent social integration with more than eight supported employees per site.

3. In one program instance, widespread and prolonged use of "intensive support" and limited use of ongoing follow-along support.

4. Off-site supervision for ongoing support with individuals with chronic mental illness (as per the exception noted in the Title VI-C regulations for "transitional employment").

5. Sometimes providing training prior to placement in supported employment (work adjustment, prevocational, and/or extensive work evaluation).

However, as the individual program summaries will substantiate, these departures in practices from guidelines at this time did not prevent these programs from obtaining good outcomes in terms of wages, benefits, integration, and hours worked. Further analysis is recommended to determine if these deviations produced the opposite effect and actually enhanced outcomes.

Further information on the overall conclusions drawn from the site reviews is presented in the following chapter, Chapter 3 - "Conclusions."

Since the eight sites vary considerably in their staff resources and ability to deliver technical assistance without negatively impacting ongoing programs, NARF advises readers to contact NARF if you are interested in either program visits or review by project staff of your supported employment program. Additionally, during 1989 NARF has limited funds available to assist with staff training and program development through networking with these programs exhibiting exemplary practices.

For information on how to obtain technical assistance from these sites contact:

Dr. Christine Mason
Director, Supported Employment Project
The National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities
P.O. Box 17675
Washington, D.C. 20041-0675
(703) 648-9300; FAX (703) 648-0346

Special Notes on Individual Site Descriptions

For the following individual site descriptions, benefits are listed under the initial "DATA" section in order of frequency with the most frequent benefit listed first. Additionally, in that same "DATA" section, "level of integration" refers to the degree of integration of supported employees. There are three levels of integration: (1) lunch and breaks only; (2) working integration (including supported employees working in clustered enclaves or supported employee work stations within a general work area); and (3) substantial working integration (including the individual placement model or dispersed enclaves with supported employees working side by side with nonhandicapped employees).

**CLAYTON COUNTY WORK REHABILITATION CENTER**

Carolyn Parker, Executive Director
221 Stockbridge Road
Jonesboro GA 30236
(404) 473-2840

Clayton County Work Rehabilitation Center, established as a joint project of the Clayton County Board of Education and Division of Rehabilitation Services, provides the full range of vocational rehabilitation services for severely disabled adults and disadvantaged youth; supported employment is a component of comprehensive placement services.

**DATA:**

No. of current placements - 72
SE model - individual and enclave
Avg wages/hr - $4.75
Avg hrs/wk - 36.52
Avg. duration on the job - 7.46 months
Job Support hrs - 27.34 monthly/6.8 weekly
*Benefits - Medical, Holidays, Vacation, Insurance, Retirement
**Level of integration - Working integration; substantial working integ.

*For site reviews benefits are listed in order of frequency with the most frequent listed fist.
**Level of integration refers to percent of supported employees who are integrated through three levels: lunch and break only, limited working integration, and substantial working integration.

The Clayton County Work Rehabilitation Center (CCWRC) offers a wide variety of services, one of which is supported employment. The Supported Employment Program's goal is to provide community based employment for severely handicapped individuals who have traditionally been unsuccessful in employment programs. The individual placement and work group models have been emphasized.

The CCWRC was established as a joint venture of the Clayton County Board of Education and the Department of Rehabilitation Services. As a work rehabilitation program, it eases the transition from the classroom to employment.

CCWRC has retained traditional vocational services and re-directed that focus towards supported community employment. This has been done by tailoring workshop contracts, streamlining the work adjustment interventions, and using vocational evaluation as a base-line tool. Since the start-up of its supported employment program in July of 1986, CCWRC has focused on integration, wages, and fringe benefits as measures of improved quality of life for consumers.

Philosophical Orientation

CCWRC's supported work program is based on a primary consideration of the need to individualize plans for achieving employment according to disability, previous work history, and support networks. As a result, a variety of job situations have been developed so that each consumer can benefit from a successful work experience. CCWRC's program is also based on a firm belief in the value of social integration and quality outcomes rather than adhering to a process such as the strict federal definition of supported employment that, while advocated by many experts, may result in lesser outcomes for the individual.

Jobs

Marketing addressed to larger corporations is consistent with CCWRC's goals of providing benefits, wages, and integration, as well as securing employer commitment to use the natural support system of the workplace. Center staff are involved with business and civic organizations. Participation in these organizations affords CCWRC an opportunity to nominate employers and individuals for awards and recognize businesses for hiring individuals with disabilities. Press releases, local recognition, and awards have strengthened the program's relationships with the community and with corporate management. Employers report that the new skills they have developed from interacting with consumers and staff contribute to their own personal growth.

Consumers have been placed in a variety of jobs and settings - clerical, janitorial, warehouse, quality control, food service, and laundry services with large local companies. Through NISH contracts, enclaves have been established in janitorial, mailing, and food services. Industries such as the airlines, retail sales and marketing, health care, and federal mailrooms reflect the local opportunities for employment.

Approach

CCWRC has placed consumers into community employment using the individual job coach model and the work group or enclave approach. The group model is one in which a company hires a group of individuals but involves them in different departments within the company. Many companies have agreed to hire 15-25 persons in various departments. The hire dates of these individuals are staggered so that job coaching can be one-on-one. Once fading begins with the first employee another is hired. The individual receives full wages and benefits offered by the company.

The NISH related work group or enclave consumers are hired by the Clayton County Board of Education to fill Federal Contracts. They may be trained as a team but branch out to be integrated with government employees while performing individual duties. As an employee of the Clayton County Board of Education the consumer is eligible for a comprehensive benefit package offered by the Board.

Clayton County Work Rehabilitation Center offers many traditional facility services in its training program; Vocational Education, Work Adjustment, Academic Remediation, and Commercial Cleaning are among these services. Most individuals move through this system quickly, spending an average of five months in the workshop (a very few clients have been in the workshop up to two years).

Following the workshop training period, openings with NISH contracts and local jobs that have been developed by the Center are matched with the consumer's needs and preferences. CCWRC's process of job matching involves not only evaluation of the consumer's work history and preferences, but also includes input from staff having contact with the consumer in a variety of situations. Vocational evaluation staff contribute information gained from formal testing and the work adjustment specialist reports observations regarding specific work sites, adjustment to the world of work, co-worker relationships, and response to supervisory authority.

Job readiness career planning and on the job training become the focus of the job coach. After the initial one-to-one training period with the job coach, follow-along is maintained through contact with the immediate company supervisor. Staff train company supervisors in behavior change techniques, behavior recording and dealing with specific consumers, so that the supervisor functions as a job coach on the job. This releases the staff to provide more intensive follow-along and crises intervention, as well as increasing the commitment of the employer.

Three important criteria for CCWRC's placements are benefits, adequate wages, and an integrated workforce. Local research conducted by Carolyn Parker, executive director of CCWRC, shows that job satisfaction and stability, in terms of length of time on the job, are related to fringe benefits. Large private business and NISH contracts which utilize CCWRC's tie to the school system all offer a full benefits package to employees. Most placements involve participation in retirement plans and paid medical benefits. Currently 96% of supported employment consumers both in private business and on NISH sites are employed for at least minimum wage.

All CCWRC work sites also meet the third criteria; i.e., they have an integrated workforce. All sites include the presence of non-handicapped workers. Integration of work groups are developed initially through individual job coaching efforts with one supported employee at a time until a good balance of employees needing differing amounts of intervention is achieved. Supported employees maintain adequate productivity levels; this has been a major factor contributing to employer satisfaction. Several supported employees have been promoted to leadworker positions, providing an opportunity for integration at the management level.

Staff

Hiring staff with a wide variety of backgrounds is essential to the success of CCWRC's program. Individuals with business and management experience in the private sector, persons with educational and rehabilitation experience, and staff experienced in vocational contracting network with each other,

sharing skills and expanding their own expertise. Currently CCWRC has employed three training specialists who function as job coaches, deliver follow-along services, and are involved in marketing and job development. Staff are responsible for individuals both in terms of initial coaching and follow-along. Often job coaches remain the key contact with larger sites which they have established. A behavior specialist assists with work adjustment goals, the implementation of behavioral change techniques, coordination with counselors and providing consultation to individuals employed both in Supported Employment and through NISH contracts.

The Center's relationship with the school system allows staff to receive salaries and benefits on the same scale as other county professional educators, contributing to a reduction in job coach turnover, and the ability of the Center to recruit personnel with advanced degrees. Staff are trained through regional training initiatives and through the Rehabilitation Continuing Education Program at Auburn University.

Consumers

Interviews with consumers as well as employers indicate a high level of satisfaction with employment and with services provided by CCWRC. Consumers are comfortable with their work and work environments and are confident of their work skills. In some settings, their ability to communicate and conduct themselves as workers, has established supported employees as role models for other employees and significantly changed the image of particular jobs. Consumers also express an overall improvement in their quality of life. Benefits and stable employment have allowed many consumers to be removed from disability and welfare rolls.

Individuals referred from mental health, vocational rehabilitation, and developmental services are served by CCWRC. CCWRC serves approximately 300 persons per year with disabilities being as follows:

Mental Retardation 40%
Physical 15%
Hearing Impaired 6%
Closed Head Injury 1%
Multiple Diagnosis 30%
Emotional 20%
Learning Disabled 1%
Cerebral Palsy 1%
JTPA Disadvantaged 25%

The Agency

All of the services of the Center are geared to preparing each individual for competitive employment. Individual plans are generated in all areas to assure that each consumer moves toward that goal. Remedial education, driver's education, living skills, work adjustment skills, job seeking skills, and referrals to community support networks for counseling and medical issues are a part of that preparation.

The Center also provides vocational services for persons who are not currently being served through participation on a county inter-agency team to identify service delivery gaps. This collaboration provides an opportunity for the program to advocate for stronger support services for consumers.

Funding

JTPA grants fund services for dropouts, displaced homemakers, handicapped and disadvantaged populations. Contractual agreements with the Georgia Department of Rehabilitation Services provide funding for Vocational Evaluation, Work Adjustment and Sheltered Employment Programs which serve persons with disabilities. The Department of Rehabilitation Services (DRS) also has awarded a 2 1/2 year demonstration grant to CCWRC which presently supports the cost of the intensive training and follow-up required for Supported Employment. Federal contracts are made available through NISH. Other services are funded through CCWRC revenues from workshop contracts. The coordination of the above funding sources assures the development and continuation of a variety of programs.

Strengths

Areas of particular strength for the CCWRC program include its relationship with the school board, DRS, and other county agencies; the strong philosophical commitment to social integration and good wages and benefits; the variety of funding sources, the use of the behavior specialist, and the management of the Center. Participation in CCWRC's services does not appear to stigmatize a particular population. Strong leadership, experience, and commitment in management positions conveys clear and directed priorities to all levels of staff.

Goals

Goals for the center focus on refinement and expansion of services and resolution of ongoing difficulties. CCWRC, like many of the other exemplary programs NARF visited, has been networking with other agencies to attack these concerns. For example, local transportation has been non-existent outside the near-by city of Atlanta, so consumers have relied on their own arrangements to get to work. In the three intervening months since the site review was conducted, CCWRC has been negotiating possible entrepreneurial contractors to establish local van services for individuals with disabilities. MARTA, Atlanta's metropolitan transit service, operating near the airport, has also been approached concerning routes and services. Some parents have now contacted consumer transportation services primarily used for the elderly and have arranged fee for service transportation.

Major obstacles encountered with the CCWRC's Supported Employment Program are funding for long term support and blending the Supported Work philosophy into existing State guidelines and regulations. The new initiative, at present, does not fit the existing system because in Supported Employment the training and support starts once the consumer is placed instead of prior to placement. Additionally, traditional roles of institutionalized service delivery methods have been "confused". Not until there is clarification and establishment of new interagency service delivery systems that assure continuity of services will supported employment be truly effective. CCWRC has been networking with other agencies in an attempt to create solutions to this concern.

The Center's goals in the next two to three years include continuing to seek employment with existing companies so that follow-up can be maintained in conjunction with training, developing an additional service-related enclave site in collaboration with other programs serving individuals with developmental disabilities, continuing NISH contracting, and expanding supported employment services to serve individuals with more severe disabilities.

Summary

NARF recommends the Clayton County Work Rehabilitation Center as an example of supported employment with a strong emphasis on social integration, benefits, and wages, as a service option provided for a variety of populations by a traditional rehabilitation program. While supported employment has resulted in re-directing such areas as contracting and work adjustment, the use of traditional vocational services for preparation for employment has continued to be a key resource to the job coach in successful job matching and placement. Using a similar approach for populations considered disadvantaged rather than disabled also (through the use of JTPA) has been a successful adaptation of the supported employment model.

---

**COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH AFFILIATES, INC.**
Marcie Dimenstein, Dir. Community Support Svs.
36 Russell Street
New Britain, CT 06052
(203) 224-6636

Community Mental Health Affiliates, Inc. operates a psychosocial rehabilitation program for adults with chronic mental illness.

**DATA:**

No. of current placements - 38
SE model - individual 75%, mobile work crew 25%
Avg wages/hr - $5.11
Avg hrs/wk - 22.27
On the job - 7.63 months
Job support hrs - 209.71
Benefits - Medical, Retirement, Holiday, Vacation
Level of integration - Working integration

The Center for Employment Development (CED) is a supported employment vocational program of the Community Support Services Department of Community Mental Health Affiliates, Inc. In existence two years, the goals of this program are to offer assistance to mental health consumers in

choosing, getting and keeping jobs. CED uses the personnel agency model, the use of more formalized job-matching assessment processes, the concept of career paths, and a mental health crisis shelter to support employees working in the community.

Philosophical Orientation

The overall mission of Community Mental Health Affiliates is to provide support services which do not currently exist in the community for individuals with chronic mental illness. The main thrust of the program is to provide a setting and service that is an alternative to the emergency and hospitalization programs. To that end, the Center for Employment Development focuses early efforts on understanding the needs of the consumer in terms of environmental support, job match, and ability of the consumer to "own" the decision to become employed at a particular job.

Jobs

Job matching procedures at CED begin informally through conversations with consumers and observations of experiences in the pre-vocational units. As needed, more formal assessment measures are introduced. Individual job sites are developed as each consumer is ready for employment with consideration of skill level, employer need, and a positive employment environment. An employer advisory board, which has as it's agenda providing and teaching CED how to access the business community, assists in this process.

Many of CED's clients have had previous work experience, allowing for a wide range of placements and levels of responsibility; for example, positions as: an inspector, medical transcriptionist, telemarketer, assembler, quality control expert, and hospital admissions officer. Employment in a client-centered contractual janitorial business (Cyclone) is also an option, as is time-limited occupational skills training subcontracted through a sheltered workshop.

Employer feedback is obtained regularly on items related to job retention - decision-making, acceptance of authority and supervision, attendance, and vocational growth potential. Employers interviewed were very satisfied with both the skills and work habits of supported employees. Job coaches were praised for their knowledge of the work requirements and individual needs. Other professionals associated with the program were also were pleased with the staff's understanding of consumer and community needs. These professionals also value CED's orientation toward creating a positive experience even when struggling through problems associated with fluctuating disabilities.

Approach

The Center for Employment Development is one of five programs under the direction of the Community Support Services Department. Residential Services, Case Management, Rehabilitative Services, and a social club provide additional professional support to the department. Pre-vocational work units are a function of Rehabilitative Services and require a close

working relationship between CED and pre-vocational staff. A client-centered business is operated as a function of CED, and two job coaches are also under the supervision of that department.

CED's personnel agency model approach to job matching, job development, and placement includes assessment of aptitude, interest, and skills; employer needs; and a positive employment environment. Many consumers have previous job experience, but for those who do not or who are not prepared to choose a particular job, CED has developed a progressive assessment procedure that involves a psychosocial work history, values clarification and career planning - each step being a more in-depth exploration of occupational decision-making. Individual program plans are developed with vocational issues as the focus, with support for those plans carried out by all services.

Each consumer's vocational planning takes into account not only past experience and present placement, but a concept of movement, of career path, so that each job experience builds upon the previous experiences. This provides direction and a definite path of advancement in terms of skills and responsibilities. Employment is not seen as static or related solely to the present functioning of the consumer, but rather as an evolving process of growth.

CED's use of a mental health crisis center is innovative not only because of the type of support which it offers, but also in the context of employment. Consistent and steady employment is seen as more beneficial than a "fall-back" concept of temporarily changing the job assignment to accommodate the present mental health needs of the consumer. Needs during crisis often can be met through professional support and a change in living arrangements to include more intensified supports.

In addition to the job coach, CED provides continuing supports through social networks, a Job Club, and crisis intervention. The job coach is more often than not asked to leave by the consumer soon after training but before new supports and networks have been established. CED has found that consumers choose to continue their connection to CMHA, Inc. for social ties and support for mental health issues. The Job Club provides on-going support for employment related issues such as social skills on the job; the social functions provide a community where the consumer feels most comfortable; and the crisis shelter operated by CMHA, Inc. provides the professional services during crisis. The crisis shelter allows the consumer to receive the support and guidance necessary to remain in the community during a crisis and to remain employed at the same job as well.

Staff

The CED staff value and contribute to the empowerment of consumers to make personal choices and decisions even when these choices and decisions are in direct conflict with the staff's assessment. Both staff and consumers have a clear understanding of the values and goals of CED. This contributes to the respect received from employers and funding agencies and to the of mutual respect between consumers and staff.

Consumers are supported in their career choice by a formalized approach to job matching and by the crisis unit. Staff are supported through their internal organizational structure which calls for frequent communication and wide representation of available services. Staff also are satisfied with their level of involvement in the decison-making aspects of the organization; their in-put is valued at all administrative and programmatic levels.

Consumers

Interviews the NARF review team conducted with consumers revealed a sense of satisfaction regarding job placements and the process involved in the choose-get-keep model. Consumers understood the relationship between environmental, work-related stress and their own mental health. Some consumers were able to recognize when the work environment added to their stress level, as well as how to access needed assistance during those particularly vulnerable periods of time. Consumers also expressed appreciation for the support services which enabled them to continue working even during times of crisis.

Goals

CED's goals over the next few years include improving the coordination of VR services and mental health services consumers, increasing outreach and education to area employers regarding CED's mission and the special needs of mental health consumers as job applicants and employees, and increasing the present number of janitorial contracts to accommodate the funding needs of a private-for-profit client staffed business.

Summary

The Center for Employment Development is recommended as an exemplary approach to adapting the supported employment model to the individuals with chronic mental illness. The CED program takes into account the unique aspects of disability and employment for this population in a manner that both maintains the dignity of the individual and prepares the consumer to avoid the social and behavioral patterns that often constitute re-hospitalization.

**EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, INC.**
Kay Holjes, Director
3509 Haworth Drive, Suite 402
Raleigh, NC 27609
(919)787-7089

Community-based service agency for adults with moderate to severe developmental disabilities.

DATA:
No. of current placements - 27
SE model - individual 85%, clustered individual placements 15%*
Avg. wages/hr - $4.15
Avg. hr/wk - 30
On the job - 11 months per placement
Job support hrs - 155 hrs/mo (intensive on-site training provided by job coaches in SELF)
Benefits - Holidays, Vacation, Medical
Level of integration - Working integration; substantial working integ.
*One site includes four individuals trained by separate job coaches; all consumers are paid directly by the employer.

Employment Opportunities, Inc. is a private, not-for-profit agency established in 1985 for the purpose of providing community-based services to persons with moderate to severe developmental disabilities. The agency currently operates three major programs: transition from school to work (Project POWER); supported employment for persons with traumatic brain injury (Project HIRES); and supported employment for persons with mental retardation, autism, and other developmental disabilities (Project SELF).

Successful Employment and Leisure Fulfillment (SELF) serves adults age 16+ with moderate to severe developmental disabilities, with priority going to persons exiting from the public school system. The project was initiated in 1986 through grants from the U.S. Department of Education and the North Carolina Council on Developmental Disabilities. The primary project goal is to secure and maintain integrated employment for consumers on at least a part-time basis, earning at least minimum wage. Examples of best practices are found in SELF's vital link with a school transition-to-work program, creativity in recruiting program-specific grant support, and development and use of consumer progress documentation.

Philosophical Orientation
SELF's program staff have developed a philosophy and values system that explores new and creative approaches. Program values are clear, concise, and evident to staff, consumers, and funding sources. Since program initiation, attention has been given to "second generation" consumer issues including overall quality of life concerns and community utilization. Family involvement, recreation, leisure, and social skills development are integral to the program.

The achievement of the individual consumer is not limited by traditional vocational evaluation, but rather each person is approached as though individual employment and community integration were the final goals, and all supports are geared toward that potential.

Approach

SELF is strictly a community-based service and is operated out of an office building which houses other regular businesses. Vocational services are complemented by travel training, leisure education, social skills training, and resource awareness training. Community resources training, such as shopping and banking, address consumer needs as an integral part of these services.

Family services operate in conjunction with all programs, and provide information to parents to empower them to prepare and advocate for their son/daughter's entry into the world of work. An additional resource that is used by all programs is Coming of age: A parent's guide to supported employment and transition from school to work (James-Manus, 1989, a parent manual regarding supported employment — what it is, how it can be helpful to students and adults, the family's role in helping to maintain employment, etc. This was developed under special foundation funding.

The case records' systems used by SELF facilitates easy documentation with directions provided at the top of each form. The format for record keeping provides an updated index for staff regarding the content and frequency of notations, making documentation concise and consistent throughout the entire system. Staff are then able to quickly reference the index, make appropriate notations and updates, and enter that data via computer so that each record is immediately complete.

Jobs

Job development is based on interviews, records, results of the consumer's volunteer work performance while in school, and personal interests. Jobs which are highly structured (versus unstructured jobs such as dishwashing) provide a high probability of job tenure. College students from seven major universities in the area compete for entry level jobs that might otherwise be available to supported employees. Therefore, employer education and preparation are integral parts of SELF's successful placement process.

A detailed task analysis is created for each job and supported employee. It is revised as needed during the intensive instruction phase. Fading is based on the individual's performance as recorded on the task analysis. Follow along is individually scheduled with the consumer and the employer.

Although enclaves and mobile crews are often the models for this population, SELF has typically developed individual job sites. An exemplary, clustered individual-placement approach in place at a box manufacturer has always been supervised by an employee of the box company and the four consumers have always been on the company payroll. Other supported employment jobs include builders, bus assistants, grocery

baggers, utility workers, assemblers, food preparers, printing company inspector, office assistant, computer output operator, mail sorters, and silverware wrappers. Each site is carefully selected with the consumer's work skills and interests in mind.

The agency's Business Advisory Council is active in developing plans and directions for the programs, including identification of employers and creative approaches in marketing to the business community. Staff are active members of various business and community organizations. Employer feedback is regularly sought for further insight into community relations, with typical employers' responses including pleasure with reduced turnover rates and quality of SELF staff.

Consumers

Supported employees range in age from 19 to 27, with a mean of 21.4 years. Slightly more than half are minority, and approximately 60 percent are males. They live in both urban and rural settings. Methods of consumer transportation include car pooling, public transportation, and taxis.

Currently, consumers work an average of 32 hours per week, with schedules ranging from 10 to 45. Hourly pay ranges from the North Carolina minimum wage of $3.35 to $6.34. Wages to consumers have steadily risen, keeping pace with or surpassing inflation rates, in a variety of occupations which have a high probability of job tenure for this consumer population.

Staff

In the SELF program, three staff are responsible for the job coaching, follow-along and community skill development, and one staff (who serves both supported employment programs) who concentrates on job development. Job coaches are cross-trained to assist in all programs as needed.

Job coaches are usually trained at the bachelors level, with degrees often in psychology or special education. Well organized administrative policies and procedures provide support and direction. Staff are encouraged to expand skills and renew their own energies through generous training opportunities. Job-specific training in the conduct of supported employment programs is provided through the program supervisor, the Developmental Disabilities Training Institute at the University of North Carolina, and the Virginia Commonwealth University's (VCU) Regional Resource Training Center. Staff participate in such conferences as VCU's annual symposium on Supported Employment and the annual N.C. Vocational Alternatives Conference. They are active members of various professional and community organizations.

Consultants are regularly involved in the development of fiscal planning and reporting, program development, individual consumer services and planning, and program evaluation.

Funding
Funding for community and leisure activities as well as supported employment is approximately 80 percent from federal, state, and foundation grants. Specific grants for quality of life issues and parent involvement provide direct funding for these activities and free up other funding sources for other direct services related to supported employment.

Goals
SELF's goals for the next few years are to advocate for increased wages, work hours and benefits for those currently employed, to expand leisure and recreational opportunities for all consumers, to provide support and educational opportunities for families of current and future consumers, and to continue to work with the local school system for students in preparation for community employment.

Summary
SELF is an excellent example of a program that believes in the individual potential of each person. Consumer achievement is not limited by disability labels (the average IQ for supported employees who are labeled with mental retardation is 40). Communicating the philosophy of human value and dignity through providing consumer-driven services is this agency's potent approach to supported employment.

---

**DALLAS EPILEPSY ASSOCIATION**
William Hewitt, Employment Program Manager
1720 Regal Row, Suite 150
Dallas, TX 75235
(214) 634-8421

The Dallas Epilepsy Association provides community-based services for persons with uncontrolled seizures.

**DATA:**

No. of current placements - 20
SE model - individual
Avg wages/hr - $4.00
Avg hrs/wk - 40
On the job - 4.5 months
Job support hrs - 21.20 on the job
57 classroom hours
Benefits - Medical, holidays, vacation
Level of integration - Substantial working integration

The Dallas Epilepsy Program established the Partners for Progress (PFP) program to provide supported employment services in 1987. Since that time individuals with epilepsy who were previously unable to be competitively

employed (historically individuals with epilepsy have a jobless rate of 20-25%) have had the opportunity to work in integrated community settings.

The strength of the Partners for Progress program rests with its ability to work cooperatively with employers to educate them about epilepsy, its impact on working in the community, procedures for handling emergency situations, and expectations for employees with epilepsy. PFP emphasizes in-depth pre-employment training, job development and placement. All consumer services are directed towards appropriate placements and maintenance on the job. PFP also has demonstrated an intense focus on job maintenance and retention issues. Regular evaluation of consumer satisfaction in a consistent manner assures quality review of the program and staff.

Jobs

PFP's job development is an on-going activity as a means of both education and the establishment of a pool of employers who are open to hiring consumers. With a moderate unemployment rate of 5.6%, systematic targeting of employers results in nearly 27 contacts for each placement. Under this system, PFP's marketing becomes an ongoing educational effort as a part of the total focus of the agency. Marketing has been an educational as well as a placement effort - epilepsy is still considered the least desirable disorder or disability group to employers. The result of such an intensive and on-going effort is the development of a reserve of potential employers interested in hiring supported employees.

PFP reviews each site for environmental factors, such as heat and noise, that might contribute to the onset of seizures, and consumers are discouraged from applying for employment where the environment is considered unsafe. A variety of placements have been secured in the areas of retail sales, building maintenance, medical assistance, mail service, printing, banking, floral nurseries and light industry. At the time of NARF's review 31 individuals were placed in supported employment.

Approach

While the vocational program is a departure from the traditional medical model for addressing the issues which face persons with epilepsy, PFP has recognized that once the frequency of seizures is under control, the emerging issues are ones of work adjustment and accessing community resources. The staff has a clear understanding of the medical issues and general health of individuals served and education of the consumer and employer is often the first thrust of the program. Attitudes towards work, productivity, independence, and communication on the job rather than skill training are the focal points of the job coaching efforts. The staff has adjusted the strategy of supported employment to meet the particular needs of both the consumer and employer through addressing myths regarding epilepsy careful environment-fit as a means of continuing to maintain control over episodes of seizures, and non-stigmatizing support through job coaching to provide a model for employers. Materials such as "Employment Action and Epilepsy" (Dallas Epilepsy Association) are used with this program.

The PFP educates employers regarding medical emergencies with supported employees and they are expected to train employees as they would other employees with only minimal support from the job coaches. Coaching is non-obtrusive, involving not more than one week on the job and is more related to follow-up efforts after placement. Prior to placement, and later, upon request, the Dallas Epilepsy program provides educational sessions with other employees regarding epilepsy and how to respond to someone experiencing a seizure.

PFP also provides sixty hours of initial classroom instruction regarding individual seizure disorders, medication, treatment plans, and the impact upon vocational goals. PFP's work adjustment training classes were developed as a result of an analysis of problems encountered in the workplace by persons with epilepsy, including information on daily living skills, stress reduction, communications skills, dealing with authority, working with co-workers, personal grooming, establishment of good work habits, using public transportation, and budgeting. Follow-up services include case management by the Adult Service Coordinator and Youth Service Coordinator of the Association, and a peer support group moderated by the vocational staff. The Dallas Epilepsy Program has emphasized quality and individual programming rather than expanding too quickly.

Staff

PFP is one of three program departments of the Dallas Epilepsy Association. Three employment training specialists are responsible for job coaching as well as general program responsibilities of job developments, placement, follow-along, and classroom training. All staff have bachelor's degrees, most have been with PFP a relatively brief time -- four have been employed for only one year. One part time staff member is shared with the Association for follow-along activities once the consumer has been closed by the Texas Vocational Rehabilitation Commission. The employment training specialists are contracted employees of the Association, documenting time and activities as they apply to each individual on their caseload. Staff meetings are structured as the primary source of communication among staff for shared caseloads.

Consumers

When they first entered the PFP program, 21 supported employees had at least monthly seizures, three had weekly seizures, and 13 were of borderline intelligence, so some overlapping problems existed. Four are currently on SSI, with none receiving SSDI benefits. These employees are now empowered in terms of responsibility and independence, with preparation beginning with classroom activities centering around work adjustment.

Supported employees are regularly surveyed regarding the program delivery of supportive and related services. Data are gathered at regular intervals throughout the program and by each new group of consumers, using the same instrument, allowing for immediate feedback for each segment of the program. This information can then be used to examine the quality of services provided by PFP over a period of time. Consumers participate in medical and vocational evaluation through services contracted by the Texas Vocational Rehabilitation Commission and the local hospitals, many of which have Epilepsy clinics associated with their out-patient services.

Funding

PFP's primary funding source is a state supported employment grant. This grant provides $99,000 for provision of services to 30 persons. Targeted job tax credits are used as an employer incentive. Relying on employers for training results in successful placements at a lower costs per placement than traditional programs which include training as a part of the job coach's responsibility.

The Agency

The Dallas Epilepsy Association also provides a full range of education, referral and support services which are available to consumers in supported employment. Epilepsy education through speakers, films, video tapes, brochures and other educational tools are utilized. Children, teen and adult programs offer trained social workers to help participants and their family members through support groups, advocacy, counseling, and recreational programs. DEA staff members conduct referrals to Dallas area neurologists, clinics, and other community services. In addition, discount services on medication, blood-level testing and medical alert identification bracelets are available.

Goals

The goals for Partners for Progress in the next few years include ascertaining long term funding for the program rather than relying on a single grant source from Texas Vocational Rehabilitation Commission, continuing to foster a system of natural supports for supported employees, and expanding employment services to include transitional employment while maintaining the supported employment program.

Summary

The PFP program demonstrates the feasibility of continued employment of persons with severe seizure disorders using the job coaching model. The program is recommended for its use of natural supports, community integration, and consumer involvement. It also serves as a model for understanding the issues involved in a cooperative medical-vocational employment effort.

**ASETS - ALASKA SPECIALIZED EDUCATION AND TRAINING SERVICES**

Dr. Karen Ward, Executive Director
2330 Nichols St.
Anchorage, Alaska 99508
(907) 279-6617

A program providing supported employment, residential, and traditional vocational services to adults with developmental disabilities and adults with chronic mental illness, including dual diagnosis.

**DATA:**

No. of current placements - 61
SE model - individual 50%, enclave 50%
Avg wages/hr - $4.52
Avg hrs/wk - 19.50
On the job - 1 year, 4 months
Job Support hrs - 5 hrs. per week
Benefits - Medical, Holidays, Vacation
Level of integration - Working integration; substantial working integ.

One of the most impressive features of the ASETS program is its current allocation of 83% of its resources to supported employment. ASETS is operated by a facility that still maintains an in-house printing business. ASETS has provided supported employment services since 1985 when 80 individuals were served in the ASETS facility program. Despite the rapid growth of its supported employment program, ASETS has maintained an extremely low staff turnover rate, with only one job coach leaving since 1985. At a time when many agencies are experiencing turnover rate of 100-200% per year, this stability is quite commendable.

Philosophical Orientation

The mission of ASETS is "to provide an array of vocational and residential options to persons with disabilities who experience functional limitations in major life activities including self-care, receptive and expressive language, learning, mobility, self-direction, capacity for independent living, and economic self sufficiency; and who, due to the severe nature of their disabilities, require ongoing support to foster increased independence, productivity and integration." As one staff member stated, "supported employment not only enhances this agency, it is the focus."

Jobs

ASETS' initial marketing was systematic with the establishment of informal networks and presentations to business and community services groups. ASETS is now well enough known that "word of mouth" appears to suffice. In any case, hard sells are avoided. When jobs are needed, the newspaper or discussions with current employers serve as good sources.

Since Anchorage is a service community without an industrial base, job opportunities are limited mainly to the service industry. Supported employees work mainly in the following areas: restaurants and fast food, janitorial and hotel/motel, animal clinics, and retail stores. Enclaves are operated in a local hospital, post office, federal building, apartment complex, airport business, and commissary.

Approach

ASETS operates seven enclaves and 20 supported worksites. Three of the enclave sites are also JWO'D contracts with 13, 26, and 7 employees with disabilities at each site. The enclaves are viewed largely as "transitional" programs to assist getting many people with disabilities employed in the community over a short period of time.

A unique approach used by ASETS is to sometimes start individuals at a wage rate slightly below the prevailing wage and then to quickly give individuals pay increases as they demonstrate skill proficiency and good on-the-job social skills. Individuals with both developmental disabilities and individuals with chronic mental illness are served by ASETS. ASETS has been very effective with individuals with developmental disabilities and has worked diligently with others in the state to get the necessary training and resources to provide quality services appropriate to individuals with chronic mental illness and dual diagnosis. A goal for the next year is to improve services in this area.

Staff

An outstanding feature of ASETS is the communication skills of the staff. An example of how these skills are encouraged is the adaptation of the Teaching Family Model evaluation system, with staff ratings of such skills as "ability to respond to questions in a pleasant manner." (See appendix C.) The attention placed on good communication, staff training, and staff evaluation has resulted in a cohesive staff that are competent.

ASETS' Director, Dr. Karen Ward, received part of her training through behaviorist Todd Risley at the University of Kansas. Dr. Risley has served as a consultant to the ASETS' program, and the influence of his Teaching Family Model has contributed to the positive results being obtained by ASETS. Dr. Ward is also well versed in the art of organizational development and uses the principles of that field to her utmost advantage. Tom Peters' Thriving on Chaos as well as other recent corporate management texts have facilitated rapid change within ASETS. Differentiated staffing also has been established to achieve career ladders for staff and contribute to staff longevity.

ASETS' staff typically have college educations and when possible Dr. Ward searches for individuals who have a background in customer services or behavioral technology. ASETS tries to locate staff who have good "people skills" and who are "open to learning new things." Additionally, ASETS has a full time staff developer and a comprehensive curriculum that was developed through incorporating some of the best features from a variety of programs. Staff usually receive one week of inservice orientation covering

individual habilitation plans (ASETS has an excellent manual), site visits, behavior modification, the family teaching model, and role plays. This is followed by pairing individuals with an experienced job coach.

When asked what advice she had for other executives considering wider implementation of supported employment, Dr. Ward stated that to maintain quality and staff there was considerable "pre-teaching to three major groups: vocational staff, Board of Directors, and residential staff."

Dr. Ward is quite familiar with the recent literature regarding supported and community employment and the ASETS program continues to improve based, in part, on Dr. Wards' interest and commitment. Her activity at the state level has included serving on a planning committee to examine quality of life issues. Dr. William Allen's (University of San Francisco) Quality of Life Assessment, for example, was reviewed by ASETS.

Interviews with ASETS staff revealed cohesiveness, a sense of direction, and staff empowerment. Interviews with supported employees indicated that they enjoyed working and were often having money for such events as vacations or personal items. As with many other sites, the degree of control an individual supported employee had over the money he/she earned varied considerably as did overall life satisfaction and ability to be involved in community activities.

Funding

Funding has been secured through the Alaska Youth Initiative, JTPA, employer contribution to overhead for enclaves, as well as the more traditional funding sources. While funding is adequate, concerns exist over resources for long-term funding and for assisting individuals currently on waiting lists.

Goals

An admitted frustration of the ASETS program is its struggle to coordinate effectively with residential service programs. Like many other supported employment staff who we have interviewed, ASETS staff reported that lack of adequate coordination and cooperation with residential providers may lead to less than satisfactory job placement and retention. Transportation also is an issue, with Alaska transit service serving a very limited area.

Goals for the next two to three years for ASETS include continuing to move individuals out of the facility, assisting to move individuals off waiting lists (ASETS also is concerned with the waiting list in Anchorage with 38 actively on the list of 78), and improving coordination with residential providers. ASETS also realizes a need to carefully evaluate current placements and spend time upgrading those placements, including being involved in career planning and considering next steps, rather than continuing to focus mainly on moving persons out of the facility. ASETS plans to be more selective with the placements that are secured during the next few years and also to work on locating placements for individuals with

severe physical handicaps and more severe disabilities. ASETS also has established a pilot enclave with the Anchorage school district for next year.

Summary
At this stage in its development. ASETS serves as an excellent model for staff development, communication, and training. ASETS also stands out as a traditional facility program that is undergoing rapid conversion.

---

**AVATRAC**
Mary Jo Snell, Executive Director
7700 Cherry Creek South Drive
Denver, CO 80231
(303) 360-0025

**A facility-based supported employment program providing an example of rapid conversion with the intent of complete conversion to integrated community employment.**

**DATA:**

No. of current placements - 120
SE model - individual 55%, enclave and group placement 45%
Avg wages/hr - $3.72 individual/$2.05 enclave
Avg hrs/wk - 24 individual/32.5 enclave
On the job - 10 months
Job Support hrs - 116
Benefits - Medical, Holidays
Level of integration - Substantial working integration; working integ.

AVATRAC, a division of Developmental Pathways, is one of the best known supported employment projects. Its director, Mary Jo Snell, has made numerous presentations, primarily based on AVATRAC's commitment to conversion. With 53% of its resources committed to supported employment, the AVATRAC program is recognized for its strategic planning and rapid conversion (supported employment services were first offered late in July 1986). All together 400 community integrated job experiences have provided community jobs for 208 people with 120 currently stabilized situations. Using many of Tom Peters' (Thriving on Chaos) principles, AVATRAC has created an environment for staff commitment and acceptance to change and commitment to excellence.

Philosophical Orientation
AVATRAC developed a list of nine statements to serve as a philosophical basis during a planned three year period of conversion. These statements refer to the rights of people with developmental disabilities to live and work in the community, and to learn complex skills with appropriate

individualized training and support. Furthermore, AVATRAC's philosophical basis reiterates the belief that people with developmental disabilities can perform valued paid work in the community with support and that the central problem of habilitation is unemployment. This philosophical premise also states that segregation is unacceptable and unnecessary.

In terms of replicating the AVATRAC program elsewhere, Ms. Snell emphatically mentioned the need for commitment from the Executive Director, the Board of Directors, the community, and the state agencies. AVATRAC has operated under the principle that values need to change before outcomes can be effected. In giving advice to other directors, Ms. Snell states "make sure you are doing it for the right reasons, not because of the money, but because of values. If values aren't right, then it is better not to proceed."

Approach

Like Alaska Specialized Education and Training Services (ASETS) and Community Services for Autistic Adults and Children (CSAAC), AVATRAC is well-connected to supported employment experts. Supported employment authors, researchers, and consultants have worked cooperatively with Mary Jo Snell and AVATRAC to assist in program planning and implementation. AVATRAC is also a University of San Francisco Supported Employment Affiliate.

AVATRAC's conversion was based on the assessed employment needs of consumers, with each department making commitments for placements and a formula for eliminating workshop staff. The largest barrier to implementation has been the lack of toileting skills for some persons, the biggest challenge is transportation. AVATRAC has chosen to convert through developing a career path within the agency with increased responsibilities and wages for community employment staff. Early on AVATRAC assigned staff readings and provided time for discussion of planned changes. Several quick pilot projects were also implemented.

While some difficulties exist with the community group placement model, AVATRAC has recognized some realities. Located in Denver with a current unemployment rate of 8-9% and a desire to enhance the lives of as many of its 248 clients as quickly as possible, AVATRAC staff made a decision to focus first on placement out of the facility in jobs at or above minimum wage. The initial job coaching activities include intensive support, with individuals in enclaves often faded in with one-to-one support. Follow-along for each individual proceeds when staff perceive the time is right, rather than relying on data collection and analysis. Follow-along cases are then served by Customer Service Representatives.

In the past six months, AVATRAC has started a program to provide careful one-to-one job matches for individuals with severe and profound disabilities. A part of that program is to use strategies to secure greater employer commitment and involvement and thus strengthen natural support systems. This experimental part of AVATRAC, funded as a special demonstration project, has served as an excellent demonstration of

procedures for job matching. As with AVATRAC as a whole, jobs are "carved" to meet the needs of the employers and the needs of the individual. The two staff members hired under this innovative component have a quota of only three job placements (including job development and job coaching services) per year, thus facilitating their emphasis on quality job matches.

Jobs

Job development efforts at AVATRAC are going through a time of changing and strengthening. The marketing manager has a firm business/marketing background and many strategies for networking with the community. AVATRAC supported employees are working in the Denver community at a variety of jobs, including jobs in light industry, service, and clerical positions.

AVATRAC has produced a videotape for job development under an OSERS grant and has sought grant funding for innovative programs. The marketing manager has a strong marketing background with previous experience working with "reentry of women into the workforce." The approach she uses is business oriented and has incorporated many of the best business principles, including avoiding human resource departments and attempting to contact directly the CEO or general manager. Attending trade shows also seems to be very effective. Six to ten jobs are developed each month, including the development of some positions necessitating coordination with unions. Job carving is one approach that can satisfy unions since a need for a unique position can provide the rationale for a non-union position.

AVATRAC has conducted an analysis of some of the least effective job placements. High turnover rates appear to be one important factor. Coworker continuity contributes to supported employee integration and skill development.

Consumers

Consumers interviewed at AVATRAC indicated enthusiasm for their jobs and paychecks. Several supported employees listed their new work supervisor as a new friend. While it is obvious that much attention has been given to this area, it also remains one on which AVATRAC plans to focus energy in the next few years. Those living in group homes sometimes expressed frustration over group home rules and the lack of freedom. Many quality of life issues have been addressed and several of the interviewees reported overall satisfaction with many community living issues.

Staff

AVATRAC handles staff development differently than some of the other programs NARF has reviewed. Rather than placing an emphasis on a college degree or special certification, staff selection is based largely on demonstrated competence. Many of the staff have been maintained from the sheltered workshop, with supported employment staff paid at a slightly higher rate than facility personnel. The attrition has been low, with only two staff leaving during the first year. Training has occurred primarily through outside workshops and on-the-job training; however, AVATRAC is considering plans for more systematic staff development.

The Agency

Developmental Pathways, the parent agency, also maintains a residential program for 160 persons, 70% of whom are in apartments and needed services purchased for 40-60 persons. Developmental Pathway's early childhood program includes 100 children from birth to five years. A trans-disciplinary approach is used with mainstreaming onto integrated classrooms and family support provided. AVATRAC is the vocational branch servicing 248 persons, currently with 95 in the sheltered workshop, 9 at a satellite center, 47 in enclaves, 68 in individual positions, 10 in a generic seniors program, and 19 in Employment Screening.

Goals

Administrative problems caused by supported employment revolve primarily around the administrative challenge of handling decentralized staff. The current greatest concern is having staff capacity to serve the needed positions. Funding of trainers and transportation also is also critical. Transportation is the foremost concern and challenge to community placement. Working more effectively with residential providers who are often faced with increased workloads also is a priority. Although funds are secured from a variety of sources including JTPA (funds one job coach), and DDP and Colorado Rehabilitation Services, Ms. Snell also described the need for continued flexibility in financing and fund usage.

During the next two or three years, AVATRAC will focus on quality and rearranging the role with industry to better utilize coworker and employer supports. AVATRAC has plans to continue to place persons in integrated settings, with more emphasis on consumer driven job development and also greater emphasis on individuals with more severe disabilities, including individuals with dual diagnosis.

Summary

NARF recommends AVATRAC particularly as an example of the systematic change process, especially for agencies interested in quickly moving individuals out of facilities and into community settings. The AVATRAC pilot project also is recommended to individuals and organizations desiring information on the use of natural supports and careful job matching for individuals with the most severe disabilities. Another exemplary feature is the job carving and current job development efforts.

**ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CITIZENS OF PALM BEACH COUNTY**
Caroline Redpath, Associate Executive Director
1201 Australian Avenue
Riveria Beach, FL 33404

The ARC of Palm Beach County provides a full range of services for children and adults with mental retardation, culminating in supported employment.

**DATA:**

No. of current placements - 19
SE model - individual, enclave
Avg wages/hr - $4.35
Avg hrs/wk - 32.0
On the job - 5.3 months
Job support hrs - 165.55
Benefits - Medical, holiday, vacation, insurance
Level of integration - Substantial working integration; working integ.

The ARC of Palm Beach County supported employment program is recognized for its approach to job development and the integration of second and third generation issues into its initial supported employment efforts which began in 1987. The ARC is outstanding in its job development practices, developing job sites on a constant basis, regardless of the number of consumers ready for supported employment. By making this a continual and consistent effort, the ARC is quite visible in the business community. The ARC combines this effort with professional networking by passing on leads for placements to other programs involved in supported employment. Good, strong and committed community relationships are the result.

Philosophical Orientation
As with many supported employment programs, the ARC's supported employment program is consumer driven. Being fully aware and in tune with the consumer's need for support has resulted in the integration of such issues as socialization networks and career paths for consumers in the program's first year of operation. The ARC of Palm Beach County, like many ARCs around the country, traditionally has been the focal point for social as well as developmental programs for children with disabilities - from pre-school to graduation. Employment in a variety of community businesses away from the ARC could have severed those life-long friendships; community employment sometimes can be identified with a loss of natural supports. Sensitive to these concerns, the Palm Beach County ARC simultaneously developed a program of adult social activities to compliment supported employment.

The emphasis on socialization, along with employer feedback indicating that consumers were capable of expanding their job duties within the first few months, led to early development of career paths, with the employers identifying untapped skills and adjusting work assignments. As a result, the concept of upward career mobility and the generation of additional skills and responsibilities on the part of the consumer became a part of every placement plan.

Jobs

Since the program began, a good working relationship has been established with area businesses with jobs developed in the hotel, hospital, banking, country club, marina, and air conditioning industries. The ARC also has been asked to present information on supported employment at meetings such as the Chef's Association and the Club Managers Association.

The ARC emphasizes the job coach model for eight industrial and most service jobs, but operates two enclaves - one staffing the laundry services a local hotel and the other for processing airline catering services. The north end of Palm Beach County is essentially a rural area in terms of transportation and availability of services. It is a tourist area with the usual seasonal employment and fluctuations. Individuals are employed as a shop assistant, houseman, dock helper, micro-fiche operator, dish washer, sanitation storage, chef's assistant, pre-school van aide, and housekeeping assistant.

Approach

The ARC program is strong in many areas - there is a high commitment to the concept of good jobs and good pay, strong family involvement, and values throughout the program that emphasize independence, quality of life, and ability to work. There is a firm belief that adults with mental retardation can work competitively and productively. The social isolation that often accompanies employment for the first time is quickly addressed and continues to be carefully monitored with on-going support. Skillful job matching results in job re-development which is minimized to career path opportunities. Job coaching emphasizes follow-along support, with fading documented to begin when the supported employee achieves a 70% on task rate. For enclaves, the work units are integrated and often involve modifications in terms of productivity expectations.

Consumers

Consumers are viewed as workers seeking the best career path. Their input and feedback once on the job is the driving force behind staff efforts. The staff's ability to be aware of and respectful of consumer needs also allows the program to remain consumer driven.

One supported employee has been acknowledged as employee of the month by APSE (an association for supported employee professionals). Several employees have received job promotions and new responsibilities, at the employer's request, as a result of their growth on the job.

Staff

The ARC's supported employment program interfaces with the secondary education pre-vocational activities located at the ARC Center. The Vocational Coordinator is responsible to the Associate Executive Director of Programs, one of four service coordinators. There are three job coaches and two enclave supervisors. Each job coach is responsible part-time for job coaching and then specializes in one other area - marketing or follow-along, for the remainder of the time. The current job developer has a strong business orientation as well as experience with educating students with disabilities. The director of the supported employment program is a dedicated professional and parent of a young adult with disabilities. Her enthusiasm and knowledge contribute much to the vitality of the program. Staff relationships are strong, with good communication, flow of ideas, and planned involvement of all staff in problem solving. The ARC staff also has taken advantage of local technical assistance efforts to expand their skills and network with other programs.

The Agency

The ARC's mission to meet the major needs of individuals with mental retardation provided the basis for development of programs of advocacy that are in direct response to consumer needs from birth through adulthood. The ARC's early incentive program for children from birth to three years old includes home based and pre-school activities emphasizing parent education and training. Pre-schoolers up to five years old are involved in formal pre-school programs providing a teacher ration of 1:3. Adult programs offer pre-vocational services, supported employment, and day care activities for older adults. Social activities involve all age groups - Scouts, Kiwanis, and an employee social club. Parents participate in Kids on the Block and Parents to Parents. The ARC also operates five group homes. Services are expanding to involve the more behaviorally challenging and medically involved residents.

A similar response to consumer needs occurred for the ARC's vocational planning. Supported employment was initiated by the Parent Support Group, coming out of a concern that adolescents were not being adequately prepared for adult roles in the community. As the ARC supported parents' and consumers' efforts to provide vocational services and began supported employment, enthusiasm and commitment to expanding participation in worker and citizenship roles became a part of the underlying structure of the program.

Funding

The Association of Retarded Citizens began its Supported Employment Program in October 1987 through a grant from Health and Rehabilitation Services. Additional funding has been secured from the Private Industry Council, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and through private fund raising. The ARC also has established an agreement to provide follow-along services after graduation for these students receiving Transitional Services through Suncoast High School. The program emphasizes job readiness in terms of work adjustment skills, socialization to counter the isolation experienced before making new friends at work, and communication skills associated with employment and the concept of career paths.

Goals

In terms of program development, the ARC is working toward finalizing many of the methods and data collection that has made it successful. Documentation of staff efforts is the next step toward full program evaluation. The goals of the program for the near future include providing a smooth transition from high school vocational programming to supported employment through cooperative agreements, increasing funding sources for supported employment, increasing employment opportunities for competitive employment for severely handicapped individuals, initiating a semi-independent living program to link with supported employment, and coordinating recreational and social activities to reduce feelings of isolation.

Summary

The ARC of Palm Beach County has developed a program of supported employment consistent with its long-standing appreciation of needs for a full spectrum of services. The enthusiasm of the staff and the needs of consumers propel this program. NARF recommends this program as an example of the influence of staff enthusiasm and commitment to quality services, and as a model for starting up a new supported employment program from an agency rather than a vocational base.

---

**COMMUNITY SERVICES FOR AUTISTIC ADULTS AND CHILDREN**

Patricia D. Juhrs, Executive Director
752 Twinbrook Parkway
Rockville, Maryland 20851
(301) 762-1650

A program providing supported employment, residential, and limited school services to adolescents and adults with autism and challenging behaviors.

**DATA:**

No. of current placements - 46
SE model - individual placement
Avg wages/hr - $4.29
Avg hrs/wk - 32.32
On the job - 3 years, 4 months
Job Support hrs - 12.84/week
Benefits - Medical, Holidays, Vacation
Level of integration - Substantial working integration

Community Services for Autistic Adults and Children (CSAAC) began as a program of community integrated employment in 1980. Since that time 60 adults have been placed into supported employment, with 46 current placements. Because of the unique nature of the population served and the risks involved, CSAAC has been very cautious in fading of support, with only four adults currently receiving only follow-along services. Basically follow-along services begin after one year without occurrence of maladaptive behaviors.

Philosophical Orientation

The philosophy of CSAAC is that "all persons with autism have the right to services provided within the least restrictive environment"...that all persons can be served in the community, including living in single family homes, working in private industry or government worksites. CSAAC endorses least restrictive, positive methods of instruction and behavioral programming. CSAAC operates under the guiding principles that persons with autism have the right to 1) specialized services to facilitate living and working among non-handicapped peers; 2) and access to services available to other members of the community.

To actualize that philosophy, CSAAC has incorporated several specialized components into its delivery system. A key feature is the connection with experts such as Dr. Anne Donnellan from the University of Wisconsin. Dr. Donnellen, a specialist in autism, has served as a consultant and offered numerous workshops through and to CSAAC. Dr. Marcia Smith (A Mary Switzer Recipient through the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research) also serves as a behavioral consultant/psychologist for the project. Dr. Smith has published several articles on nonaversive behavior modification, managing aggressive behaviors, and developing social skills at the worksite in a variety of journals, including the Journal for the Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps (JASH) and the Journal of Behavioral Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry.

Approach

Careful use of nonaversive behavior modification, particularly environmental control, has allowed CSAAC to operate programs in community settings with low rates of inappropriate behavior. Individuals with self-injurious and stereotypical behaviors, for example, are maintained in carefully selected community settings, most often with one job coach/supervisor. The most frequent model CSAAC follows is placement of two individuals per site with the continuous presence of a CSAAC staff member to assist with very specific behavior problems. CSAAC further enhances opportunities for integration and acceptance through, whenever possible, integrating supported employees at different work stations rather than positioning the two supported employees side-by-side. Supported employees are routinely taught to complete many tasks, thus furthering their opportunities to be "valued employees."

Another specific component contributing to the success of CSAAC is its use of systematic social skills training at the work site. For example, eye contact is trained during a formal structured practice session early in the morning for one employee with observations of skill generalization occurring later that same day.

Data are collected in both training and generalizations sessions. Comprehensive data are gathered on work behaviors with an intricate staff evaluation system established to stress the importance of both using suggested techniques and maintaining appropriate data files. (See Appendix C for a sample of that form.) The data are used schematically to fade support and implement needed interventions. Dr. Smith has published a

manual, "Working with Autism: Strategies for Achieving Behavioral Adjustment at Work--Revised" (Smith, 1988), which provides detailed instructions and examples of monitoring behaviors in the workplace.

Many CSAAC supported employees are working at rates at or above the norm for the businesses in which they are employed. At several sites observed during NARF's project visit, the high productivity level and the appropriateness of the social skills made it impossible to pinpoint the CSAAC supported employees. Despite the severity of their disability, many of CSAAC's supported employees are now riding buses to work, even when complicated transfers are necessary.

Individuals observed during the site review were treated with dignity and respect. For example, one individual with "head hitting" problems was prompted "relax, don't panic" rather than using more stigmatizing terms for a verbal prompt.

Jobs

Individuals with severe behavior problems have been employed up to seven years in a variety of community settings with support from CSAAC. CSAAC has established an array of community jobs in such industries as electrical parts assembly, book binding, printing, retail stores, and silk-screening. These jobs have been selected for individuals by matching the individual's strengths and behavior difficulties with sites where a) the difficulty might become an asset as in the case of high repetitive hand behaviors translating to appropriate machine use; and b) the environmental arrangement, task complexity, and production needs are compatible with the individual's level of functioning.

Strengths

Another specific feature of CSAAC which exemplifies its strengths is the training programs it has offered. CSAAC has hosted a variety of seminars and workshops on such topics as non-aversive behavioral control and community employment for individuals with challenging behavior. Pat Juhrs, also serving as Director of the Training Institute for CSAAC, has been tenacious in securing needed legislative funding and grant assistance for specific projects such as the training seminars. The CSAAC program is well publicized with many newspaper articles, fourteen publications, and two videotapes" "Almost Like You and Me" and "Behavior Technology for Living and Working in the Community."

CSAAC, in addition to offering supported employment, also provides residential services and operates a school program for eight high school youth needing specialized services. CSAAC has won numerous awards including the 1987 Residential Services Award from NAPRFMR. In 1986 CSAAC was identified as a Model Program by the Syracuse University Center on Human Policy. In 1986 and 1987 it also received a special award from the Washingtonian Magazine for its services to people with autism.

Staff

In terms of organizational management, CSAAC is operated with rigorous training of staff (currently numbering 27). Staff are required to complete a series of competency based training modules (including videotapes and reading materials) developed by CSAAC. CSAAC staff are quite skilled at specific behavioral techniques and much attention has been focused on the correct use of behavioral shaping and reinforcement procedures, data collection, and skill generalization.

Goals

While it is an expensive program due to the ongoing support provided almost all supported employees, CSAAC demonstrates very effectively that individuals with severe behavioral, cognitive, and communication problems can work competitively in the community. During the next few years CSAAC plans to spend time refining its system and analyzing other possible accomplishments. Greater attention to consumer empowerment and quality of life issues are a part of CSAAC's upcoming agenda, as is a program to reassess opportunities for supported employees. Plans for more effective coordination with residential providers are also underway.

Summary

NARF staff recommend the CSAAC program as an example of a program with excellent data collection and staff training procedures. CSAAC also provides a model of how to effectively place and maintain persons with severe behavior problems and autism in the community; a part of that success is its use of non-aversive behavior modification and on-site social skills training. CSAAC is a good contact for assistance in these areas as well.

## Chapter 3

## CONCLUSIONS

The primary conclusion that can be drawn from NARF's review of exemplary practices is that supported employment is working. Individuals with a wide range of severe disabilities are being employed with ongoing support in communities varying in terms of size, economic conditions, and region of the country. Factors such as agency size, planning, staffing arrangements, staff skill, employer commitment, and type of employment may contribute to different outcomes for supported employees. Nonetheless, supported employment can be successful under widely varying conditions.

Another major conclusion is that agencies that obtain quality outcomes for consumers share some things in common. Unwavering commitment from the executive director and from the director of supported employment were noted at all sites. All programs were dedicating effort to obtaining community placements. A third common area for all programs NARF visited was that problems were occurring and issues still were being addressed — no place was problem-free.

Programs also had common concerns — concerns primarily related to funding, scheduling transportation, coordinating with residential services, placement, and program administration. Constraints on interagency collaboration also have been identified by Noble and Conley (1989). These include: differing treatment philosophies among agencies; potential threat to revenues and jobs; competition for revenues; and disagreements over the amount and kind of reporting necessary for joint ventures. Yet, despite these difficulties, collaboration, networking, and planning for problem resolution were occurring at each site NARF reviewed.

Areas of differences also were noted for both operational strengths and for areas of concern. Some programs had strong staff development and training programs. Some programs had strong organizational development and strategic planning. Some programs had low staff turnover and some had high turnover. Some had resolved how to place individuals with the most severe handicaps, while other agencies were still addressing that issue.

Some agencies were skilled in careful one-to-one job matching. These agencies typically had not made as many community placements during the past two to three years as had agencies which placed less emphasis on one-to-one matching and more on movement to community jobs. Yet, agencies that had proceeded one way, often were now either refining their job placement practices or searching for ways to accelerate community placements. A review of the current data and projected goals for the eight programs indicates that agencies are all in a period of transition and that there is movement toward greater cohesiveness in terms of predicted outcomes and procedures two to three years from now.

**Role of Freedom in Implementation**

The review of exemplary practices has led NARF to conclude that freedom in the implementation of supported employment has been critical to its widespread use and success. The examination of exemplary practices as defined by NARF; that is, as defined by good outcomes for supported employees across varying conditions, has confirmed the value of using guidelines, support systems, information dissemination, and peer support to establish practices. Despite restrictive federal regulations, rehabilitation programs have been creative in securing needed supports to operate effectively according to local community concerns, agency history and orientation, and local consumer needs. These programs have evolved over the past few years using a variety of avenues of support. This is in contrast to following predetermined rules determined by what is often perceived as an "abstract body of experts."

**The Need for Standards and Criteria**

Supported employment professionals have debated the need for standards and certification criteria, and although concern has existed over the potential mismanagement that can occur, the results of NARF's review suggests that the field must weigh the potential damage that could occur were even more rigid guidelines to be implemented. Considerations such as staff background and educational status, agency size, management practices (authoritarian versus participative), group versus individual models, degree of severity of disabilities for individuals placed in supported employment, the skills and techniques used in job development, funding sources utilized, and actual operational and evaluational procedures simply could not be counted on to make the critical difference in the success of supported employment for either the agency or the individual.

NARF did not review programs obtaining unsuccessful outcomes; i.e., poor wages, benefits, hours, and integration and/or low retention of supported employees. However, a question the field must address relates to this other side of the equation. For programs obtaining good results, no need can be seen to tighten regulations, but what of programs that are ineffective? Would tighter regulations help? Perhaps. Are they the answer? Perhaps. However, an examination of Schalock's (1988) system's model, for example, suggests that in this stage of evolution, the influence of peers and competitive programs will facilitate improvement in programs.

Strategies such as information sharing, highlighting best practices, and providing easily available technical assistance that is designed to address unique, individual needs have a high probability of being successful. Current indications from discussions with program executives and supported employment specialists from around the country suggest that there currently is a very high level of interest in the "best approaches." Seminars offering information on supported employment continue to be well received and in high demand.

**Conversion and Supported Employment Approaches**

Of the programs NARF reviewed, the two agencies with the largest "conversion," AVATRAC and ASETS, both had used enclaves or group supported employment models as a part of their strategy. After three years of implementation, both agencies are now more involved with individual placements and have goals to further their efforts in this area.

**Models of Supported Employment**

While most managers will be quick to concede that often the best outcomes are obtained with the individual placement model, exceptions exist. JWO'D contracts are one example. These federal contracts can result in pay of $10-12/hour and higher.

Managers also report that administratively enclaves sometimes are easier to establish and operate. Conversations with employers indicate that sometimes hiring a "group" to complete a task provides a much more important benefit to the company than hiring one employee. Sometimes managers need to be able to experiment with both approaches, observe the results in their own locale, confer with their own staff, board, and consumers, and then make decisions.

Some rehabilitation managers also report greater confidence in group community placements for individuals with severe behavior problems, more medically fragile conditions, or more serious physical or intellectual impairments. Sometimes these same managers, after gaining experience with the individual placement model, and after gaining community experience with enclaves, are then ready to try one-to-one placements with individuals with more severe difficulties. Such seems to be their learning curve. A question that needs to be asked relates to the problems and issues surrounding such an approach and such a learning curve. The question is really related to consumer empowerment as well.

**Consumer Empowerment**

Will consumers be more empowered and will they obtain a greater quality of life more readily with restrictions placed on the type of supported employment approach? The evidence from NARF's site reviews is that supported employment is an evolving process, consumers are becoming more empowered -- not only due to supported employment, but also because of a variety of concurrent legislative and community efforts.

**Systems Change**

Information on models of systems change (Schalock, 1988; Barcus, Griffin, Mank, Rhodes, & Moon, 1988) indicates that participants need to be involved in the design and implementation of the change. Supported employment policy has been formulated by a variety of nebulous groups of experts, such as the policy group of project directors, staff of research and training centers, and State Directors of Mental Retardation/DD identified by Wehman,

Kregel, Shafer, and West (1989) in their review of the 27 state model demonstration programs. Another study reported in that same document determined "critical evaluation issues for federal and state policies" by asking the administration of the National Institute of Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) and Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) (Wehman, Kregel, Shafer, & Twardzik (1989). However, policy needs to come from consumers — supported employees, potential supported employees, parents, and employers — and from individuals who will be facilitating the change — providers, as well as researchers and state and federal officials.

### Commonalities Among Agencies with Exemplary Practices

Reviewing the results of the eight site reviews obtained with the use of NARF's Supported Employment Profile (Appendix A) has enabled NARF to reach some specific conclusions regarding exemplary practices. Some of the most salient follow:

1. Strong leadership and philosophical commitment were noted for each program.

2. This philosophical commitment was usually evident in reviewing the programs' mission statement, most often it had been revised to reflect an investment in community employment of persons with severe disabilities.

3. Many programs demonstrated a high level of family involvement early on when the program was initiated; many of these same programs realized a need to once again focus more energy on communications with families.

4. Most programs are working on developing career ladders and obtaining a variety of jobs that reflect the range of opportunities available in their local community.

5. Locating jobs that pay at or slightly above minimum wage was not nearly as difficult as obtaining adequate hours and benefits. Some programs were more successful than others in this regard.

6. Supported employees are making valuable contributions to the local economy and the local labor force.

7. Physical integration was more readily achieved than social integration. Most group sites included adequate opportunities to work next to non-handicapped employees; some were more effective than others in dispersing supported employees throughout a work area rather than clustering a group together.

8. Better job matches typically were made with the use of the individual placement model; however, program managers were typically aware of this and were considering next steps for program improvement.

9. Consumer empowerment in the community, control over wages earned, and other non-work quality of life issues are only now beginning to be addressed by most of the programs NARF visited. This may reflect in part the lack of an initial outcome criteria related to these issues. To achieve results in this area, tangible criteria need to be introduced.

10. Consumers' interviews generally indicated overwhelming enthusiasm for their work, their supervisors, their coworkers, and their wagers. More discrepancy was noted for residential and other non-work quality of life issues.

11. Cooperation with residential providers varied; however, most sites indicated that difficulties existed in coordinating with residential providers and that working with persons living independently or semi-independently in the community was easier and preferred. (This does not reflect the level of disability, individuals with severe disabilities were in many instances living semi-independently.)

12. Assessment techniques varied widely, with the exception that materials such as the Job Analysis and Job Match forms provided by Virginia Commonwealth University are used universally. Social skills are better addressed by some programs than others.

13. Natural supports are only just beginning to be used, several programs are expanding efforts in this area.

14. Independent travel training in the community was of greater emphasis in some programs than others; most programs continue to explore options and investigate procedures to better resolve transportation concerns. Most are attempting to use agency transportation only as a last resort.

15. Efficiency of staff training varied, with the sites placing greater emphasis on staff skills and evaluating specific skills achieving the most effective results.

    The seriousness of staff training and retention issues is confirmed by results of a survey by Rusch, Trach, Winking, Tines and Johnson (1988). Examining events in the state of Illinois, these authors found that 69 of 144 job coaches left their position during the course of one year. Of those 144 job coaches, 34% had bachelor's degrees in special education, rehabilitation, psychology or social work and 4% had master's degrees. Additional information on retention and effectiveness of job coaches according to amount of education and training is needed.

16. Some organizations are devoting greater efforts to measuring consumer satisfaction; most agencies are investigating procedures and trying out new strategies.

17. Organizational management and organizational development varied. Programs undergoing conversion had the greatest emphasis on these areas. Staff turnover also tended to be less for the programs with strong organizational development.

18. Some systems had more open and direct communication than others; staff tended to prefer such a pattern.

19. In many cases, supported employment is not currently costed separately, and individual tracking occurred mainly for those programs submitting required data to a state agency or university program.

20. Marketing approaches varied, with adequate job development at all sites and with the realization that job development for the individual placement model needed to proceed differently than for group placements. Generally, one individual was responsible for job development, with other supported employment staff sometimes involved.

21. Most agencies had formed some sort of relationship with the local school district. However, as others have indicated (Emener & Griswold, 1985) greater emphasis on school-rehabilitation collaboration is needed. While for the programs visited, relationships have been formed with school districts; relationships tended to be in the initial stages, with none yet systematic and efficient.

22. All agencies provided on-site staff training, matching with an experienced job coach or supervisor as a part of the training. Those agencies which had also developed or adapted job coach training materials typically had staff with better, more uniform training skills.

23. Staff were overwhelmingly enthusiastic about supported employment — the practice and the results.

24. All programs had business advisory councils or boards with local business persons who assisted with marketing.

25. Some programs were more effective than others with using 1619(a) and (b) and PASS or IWRE.

26. Some programs had tapped a variety of funding sources, others were relying primarily on the VR and MH/MR funds, several had special grants for specific projects.

27. Job coaching tended to be nonintrusive in that it appeared not to interfere with ongoing business operations and job coaches wore company uniforms and otherwise adhered to the employer's requirements. In some cases, usually during the initial intensive support phase, the special help given to a particular employee was quite obvious. However, generally both the job coach and supported employees were well integrated into the program and were not readily identifiable, sometimes even in the instances involving individuals with extreme behavior disorders, autism, and severe retardation.

28. Worksites varied in their ability to be modified to enhance production. Sometimes strict company policies prevented adaptation of more effective procedures.

29. Fading of supervision varied widely. Some programs followed the guideline of initiating follow-along when "70% of tasks are completed accurately," others used staff judgment.

30. Most programs had high retention rates for supported employees; most job movement was related to job advancement. As programs matured, they became better at locating effective initial placements.

31. Most exemplary programs were well connected to university experts and other consultants and/or provided consultation to others as well. This is consistent with other findings and conclusions, such as a study by McDonough, McGaughey, Van Gelder, and Kiernan (1988). McDonough et al., from a study of 272 agencies providing vocational agencies in Massachusetts, concluded that "ultimately the impact of supported employment services on the lives of persons with disabilities will depend on the collaborative efforts of professionals, families, employers, school personnel, state agency staff, and individuals with disabilities." (p. 20).

32. Professionals in the field tended to rate the programs more enthusiastically than employers. Employers were positive and yet more cautious, often stating what they would need to know before assuming future placements.

Areas of common concern or areas currently being pursued by the supported employment programs NARF reviewed include:

1. Funding, including securing additional start-up funds, finding long term funding, influencing state/federal legislators, state-wide planning, being cost effective, and better negotiations with SSA. Wehman, et al., (1989) also concluded that a "major reason for uneven implementation, both locally within states as well as nationally, is the inability of some states to fully cooperate and share resources" (p.11). Greater provider agency involvement in such deliberations could be a "boon" to the field.

2. Planning and coordination, including coordination with residential service providers, planning/providing transportation, issues related to who to serve and waiting lists, working with schools, working with parents, using consultants, being consultants, and working with other agencies to more effectively locate the right jobs and implement supported employment.

3. Organizational development, including examining staff training and career ladders for staff, examining agency structure and the individual versus group approach to supported employment, considering brokering services and developing training materials.

## Implications

Implications from NARF's review of exemplary practices are at least as numerous as the conclusions reached. However, the information gathered from the review of exemplary practices falls into several categories having different levels of impact for different types of programs. These categories are related to the following topics: philosophy, job development, quality of outcomes, coordination with others, assessment and monitoring systems, social skills, natural supports, training and staff development, organizational development, collaboration, disincentives, working with employers, and supported employment methodology and techniques.

Agencies which are considering entry into supported employment would be well advised to: (1) assure strong philosophical commitment from the executive director on down; (2) match the job development process to the local economy and values; (3) consider collaborative solutions to difficulties that are encountered; and (4) develop a plan for organizational development and staff training at the local level. Agencies already engaging in supported employment may wish to review their procedures and outcomes against the areas associated with quality outcomes and address any necessary issues. Agencies engaging in other rehabilitative efforts may need to review supported employment and reconcile its orientation and philosophical premise with the agency's mission. Agencies also may find NARF's revised Supported Employment Quality Indicators Profile (Appendix B) a useful tool for self evaluation as a basis for planning future supported employment activities.

### Employers

Employers interested in exemplary practices may wish to consider supported employment from several perspectives: the company's, the provider's, and the supported employees'. From the employer's perspective, the most relevant issues are most likely related to productivity and quality of services provided. Organizations that emphasize staff training and have lower staff turnover sometimes facilitate better training as well as better job matching. However, current information is far from definitive in this area.

Companies also may be interested in the type of support and backup services provided. If staff turnover is an issue, hiring individuals with developmental disabilities may bring more solutions than hiring persons with chronic mental illness, for whom job stability is often a concern. Employers interested in tax credits may also wish to work directly with service providers who volunteer to assist with securing Targeted Job Tax Credits (TJTC).

Companies interested in working closely with providers may wish to consider ways to enhance outcomes for supported employees, including consideration of safeguards provided by the company. For example, some companies use "beepers" to be reached quickly if needed after follow-along has been implemented. Employer financial contributions can also assist providers and supported employment programs through collaborative efforts to stretch dollars and serve as many individuals as possible in community settings.

Companies concerned about the best outcomes and working conditions for supported employees should consider working closely with rehabilitation providers or rehabilitation engineers to make the necessary job accommodations, including possible modifications in the physical work setting, equipment use, and/or modifications in work tasks. Companies truly desiring to contribute substantially to the integration movement need to examine their businesses for the development of career ladders and the use of natural supports, including coworkers as job coaches. Social integration also needs to be planned for and pursued. Employers can facilitate this integration through looking for and supporting opportunities for communication among workers with and without disabilities.

**Where are We Headed?**

Fred Isbister, Supported Employment Specialist for Rehabilitation Services Administration, in January of 1988 facilitated the gathering of a group of "supported employment experts." That group of approximately thirty-five university professors, consumers, advocates, officials from federal agencies, and rehabilitation providers has held subcommittee meetings and teleconferences, and completed work assignments over the past year. On November 2, 1989, in Washington, D.C. that group met again and drafted recommendations and a national supported employment strategic plan. These included recommendations to compile existing data bases for "Exemplary Supported Employment Practice" and to work toward some common understanding and promotion of quality practices. As these data are gathered a more comprehensive picture of quality practices may emerge.

However, at this stage, NARF has already completed some steps which may assist with some "standardization" of the concept of quality. These steps have included: (1) reviewing criteria of other programs examining quality and using those criteria as appropriate to this project; (2) continuing to review information from other projects as it is developed; and (3) attempting to make some comparisons about programs. This third activity is complicated due to the differences in program review procedures and guidelines for reports. Over the next few months this activity will continue and it is our desire to establish a more global approach to identifying quality within the next six months.

In terms of supported employment practices and outcomes, indicators are that the use of natural supports, including coworkers as job coaches will expand and that innovative ways to reduce costs will be found so that ongoing community support can be financed for more individuals. Nell Carney, Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services Administration, has announced that supported employment regulations will be opened up for revisions (Carney, 1989). Our predictions are that attempts will be made to promote the intent of the regulations without continuing with the unnecessarily restrictive limitations. Hence, another prediction is that the concepts of innovation and flexibility will be furthered and creative solutions to many supported employment dilemmas will be developed.

Issues related to hours and benefits will be less easy to resolve; SSI/SSDI serve as considerable disincentives to expanded work hours. However, the social security administration has funded several innovative projects. These projects are examining procedures to decrease reliance on social security while assuring adequate medical benefits and income.

**Integration issues.** In regard to integration, Mank and Buckley (1988) have defined integration

> in its simplest and most elegant form as a degree of community presence and participation for persons with disabilities that is no different than that enjoyed by persons without a disability label. (p. 320).

Although Chadsey-Rusch et al. (1989) has formulated the basics for examination of social integration, indicators are that achieving true social integration will be complex and although demonstration programs will emerge, in terms of everyday implementation, attention to social integration will be delayed by overriding fiscal and other more basic programmatic concerns. Funding model programs and dissemination of outcomes is critical in this area.

**Training.** The Supported Employment Panel of Experts in their recent meeting (November 2, 1989) also recommended examination of a "core supported employment curriculum" for training job coaches and other supported employment staff. Within the next year, key components for a core curriculum that maintains the flexibility needed to address different populations and conditions (including regional differences, economic situations, preservice vs. inservice needs, rural vs. urban issues, industry-specific issues, provider agency needs, and funding concerns) will be identified. Such a core curriculum, if developed with adequate flexibility, could enhance outcomes for supported employees and stabilize staffing patterns.

**Quality Assurance.** Monitoring and quality assurance are also concerns of the Supported Employment Panel of Experts. NARF's Supported Employment Quality Indicators Profile and other similar instruments should be valuable self-evaluation tools. Maintaining efforts at self-examination and using collaborative and innovative procedures can assist the supported employment/community integration movement. Nothing less than consumer choice regarding employment and training preferences for all adults with disabilities should be accepted. However, implementation will vary and services for all will necessitate creative utilization of resources. So if anything can be anticipated, it is variety and continued change as further development and expansion of supported employment occurs.

## Summary

To meet the needs of the field, rehabilitation practices need to evolve, and time must be a given. Dissemination of information on exemplary practices is critical to using time as efficiently as possible and thus arriving at the best outcomes for as many individuals as possible, as quickly as possible. NARF encourages rehabilitation providers, employers, consumers, and others to interpret the recommendations and suggestions from this report with due consideration of the evolutionary nature of this movement. For as practices evolve, quality also evolves.

The challenge to the field is not merely to accept the levels of quality presented herein but to become actively involved in furthering quality and taking the issues to yet another level of expectation. The challenge is to become an active participant in the process of obtaining increasingly better outcomes for persons with disabilities. The challenge is also to work towards "outdating this document." We gladly offer up the challenge as well as our whole-hearted support for such efforts.

## REFERENCES


BPC Publishing, Ltd. (1975). Job satisfaction index. Phoebus Publishing Co.

Barcus, M., Griffin, S., Mank, D., Rhodes, L., & Moon, S. (Eds.). (1988). Supported employment implementation issues: A summary of discussions from the VCU RRTC-employment network issues forum: Future directions for supported employment. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, School of Education.

Carney, N. (1989, November 2) Presentation to the Supported Employment Panel of Experts. Washington, D.C.

Chadsey-Rusch, J., Gonzalez, P., Tines, J., & Johnson, J.R. (1989). Social ecology of the workplace: Contextual variables affecting social interactions of employees with and without mental retardation. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 94(2), 141-151.

Emener, W.G., & Griswold, P.P. (1986). Rehabilitation programs and the need for synergy and interrelated policy development: The OSERS school-to-work initiative. The Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, Inc., 10(2), 40-48.

Hackman, R.J., & Suttle, L.J. (1977). Improving life at work: Behavioral science approaches to organizational change. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Co., Inc.

Hudson Institute. (1988). Opportunity 2000: Creative affirmative action strategies for a changing workforce, (Grant No. 99-6-3370-75-002-02). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

J.M. Foundation: (1988). Learning from the best: 1987: A profile of America's finest vocational programs serving people with disabilities. New York: Author.

James-Manus, T., (Ed.). (1989). Coming of age: A parent's guide to supported employment and transition from school to work. Raleigh, NC: Employment Opportunities, Inc.

Keith, K.D., Schalock, R.L., & Hoffman, K. (1986). Quality of life: Measurement and program implicators. Lincoln, NE: Region V Mental Retardation Service.

Kiernan, W.E., Sanchez, R., & Schalock, R. (1989) Economics, Industry, and Disability in the Future in W.E. Kiernan & R.L. Schalock (Eds.), Economics, industry, and disability.(p.365-374). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Kiernan, W.E., & Schalock, R.L. (Eds.). (1989). Economics, industry, and disability. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Kregel, J. (1989). Opportunities and challenges: Recommendations for the future of the national supported employment initiative. In P. Wehman, J. Kregel, & M.S. Shafer, (Eds.), Emerging trends in the national supported employment initiative: A preliminary analysis of twenty-seven states (pp. 128-137). Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Supported Employment.

Mank, D.M., & Buckley, J. (1989). Strategies for integrated employment. In W.E. Kiernan, & R.L. Schalock (Eds.), Economics, industry, and disability (pp. 319-335). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

McDonough, K.E., McGaughey, M.J., Van Gelder, M., & Kiernan, W.E., (1988). Survey of supported employment training needs for adult service providers (Grant #87-VI-3). Boston, MA: The Training and Research Institute for Adults with Disabilities at the Children's Hospital.

National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities. (1989). Supported employment in Context: NARF's national scope supported employment survey and policy implications. Washington, D.C.: Author.

National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities. (1989b). NARF's supported employment quality indicator's profile. (Developed under Project #G00874515, Office of special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education). Washington, D.C.: Author.

Noble, J.H., Jr., & Conley, R.W. (1989). The new supported employment program: Prospects and potential problems. In W.E. Kiernan & R.L. Schalock, (Eds.), Economics, industry, and disability, (pp. 207-222). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Peters, T.(1988). Thriving on chaos. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Rehabilitation Network of New England. (1988). Catalog of exemplary programs, (Grant #60086C3520). Andover, MA: The Network, Inc.

Sale, P., Wood, W., Barcus, J.M., & Moon, Sherril, M. (1989). The role of the employment specialist. In W.E. Kiernan, & R.L. Schalock, (Eds.), Economics, industry, and disability, (pp. 187-205). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Schalock, R.L. (1988). Critical performance evaluation indicators in supported employment. In P. Wehman, & M.S. Moon, (Eds.), Vocational rehabilitation and supported employment. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Schalock, R.L., & Hill, M.L. (1986). Evaluating employment services. In W.E. Kiernan, & J.A. Stark (Eds.), Pathways to employment for adults with developmental disabilities (pp. 285-302). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Smith, M.D. (1988). Working with autism: Strategies for achieving behavioral adjustment at work--revised. Rockville, MD: Community Services for Autistic Adults and Children.

Standing Committee on the Status of Disabled Persons, (1988). 3,300,000 Canadians. Insights from the Parliamentary Forum on the Status of Disabled Persons. Ottawa, Canada.

Storey, K., & Knutson, N. (1989). A comparative analysis of social interactions of workers with and without disabilities in integrated work sites: A pilot study. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 24(3), 265-273.

Wehman, P., Kregel, J., Shafer, M.S., & West, M. (1989). Supported employment implementation I: Characteristics of persons being served. In P. Wehman, J. Kregel, & M.S. Shafer, (Eds.), Emerging trends in the national supported employment initiative: A preliminary analysis of twenty-seven states (pp. 46-74). Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Supported Employment.

Wehman, J., Shafer, M.S., Kregel, J., & Twardzik, G. (1989). Supported employment implementation II: Service delivery characteristics associated with program development and costs. In P. Wehman, J. Kregel, & M.S. Shafer (Eds.), Emerging trends in the national supported employment initiative: A preliminary analysis of twenty-seven states (pp. 75-96). Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Supported Employment.

# APPENDIX A

## APPENDIX A
## METHODS

Data on exemplary practices were obtained through an involved process prescribed by NARF's Supported Employment Advisory Council. That process included:

A. Obtaining nominations.

B. Multiple screening procedures.
   1. Original nominations
   2. Screening nominations
   3. Evaluation of screening data
   4. Telephone interviews.

C. Final evaluation and Determination of Sites

D. Site Reviews

With the assistance of its Advisory Council, NARF determined the feasibility of implementing a review process that was developed as the data were obtained. While this may be an unusual process, the lack of precedent procedures for evaluating supported employment programs along with budgetary and time limitation provided a rationale for such an approach. Hence, the procedures utilized were developed as data were received and are the result of the input from the Advisory Council over an eight month period of time.

### A. Obtaining Nominations

Nominations were obtained through (1) nominations from NARF's 1988 National Scope Survey of Supported Employment Practices; (2) self-nomination; (3) nominations submitted from state rehabilitation specialists and the 27 state demonstration projects; and (4) multiple announcements of the competition including: announcements in the NARF and TASH (The Association of Individuals with Severe Handicaps) newsletters and announcements to over 200 national supported employment experts.

### B. Multiple Screening Procedures

#### 1. Original Nominations

The 183 nominations received were screened using the following procedures:

a. Nominees completed NARF's 1988 National Scope Supported Employment Survey (NARF, 1989). This survey was completed by 122 organizations.

b. An Outcome Referenced Screener (Phase 1 Screener) was disseminated to all nominees. This Outcome Referenced Screener collected information on a maximum of 15 individuals served, including information on: type of disability, wages, hours, benefits, hours of support, and level of integration. In addition, narrative information was obtained for examples of benefits, problems incurred, and procedures implemented to overcome problems.

   Eighty-three Outcome Referenced Screeners were returned (five without surveys, in which case a second copy of the survey was mailed and returned).

c. Supported Employment project staff examined data from the surveys and the Outcome Referenced data. Seventy-six organizations met the criteria of returning both instruments and having been in operation at least one full year.

d. A Phase 2 Screener was used to obtain additional information on the agencies, including: changes in tables of organization, mission statements, goals for the next 2-3 years, types of employment, staff positions and salaries, references, and feasibility of replication.

e. Phone interviews with employers and state agency officials were conducted.

**2. Screening Nominations**

The nominations were screened beginning with the Outcome Referenced Screener. The use of outcomes as the first screening was based upon the advice of the NARF Advisory Council to measure exemplary practices by placing a first priority emphasis on positive outcomes for supported employees. Nominations were rated according to the following seven criteria:

> wages, benefits, level of integration, severity of disability, hours worked per week, and narrative information on job satisfaction and overcoming barriers.

Rankings were obtained for the 83 nominees who completed the Outcome Referenced Screener through the following process:

1. All identifying information was removed from the completed screeners for each nomination.

2. The data were submitted to five experts from the NARF Advisory Council, including four university professors and one facility executive.

3. Each member of the panel of experts independently rated the nominations on a Likert-type scale of 1-5, with 5 representing the highest rating. Members were instructed to consider the outcomes in relation to the Supported Employment model issued and severity of the individual's disability. (Previous discussions with the NARF Advisory Council determined that lower wages were more commonly associated with the group model.) Such instructions served to assist raters so that they could compensate for the differences in wages and benefits that might occur according to the severity of disability or the model of Supported Employment.

4. The data were submitted to NARF and combined to determine overall rankings. The mean score was 3.6, with a range of 1.6 to 4.0.

Phase 2

A decision was made to contact all nominees who had completed the Outcome Referenced Screener and obtain background information related to the process used to obtain their reported supported employment outcomes. Fifty-one organizations returned the Phase 2 Screener. These data were reviewed and the Advisory Committee recommended making the final selection for interviews based on the Outcome Referenced data, using Phase 2 information to provide information on procedures used to obtain the reported outcomes. Project staff quantified Phase 2 data using a 1-5 Likert-type scale. This was later used as a minor element in determining the final selection.

**3. Evaluation of Screening Data**

The ratings for the 51 organizations completing all the screening information were averaged to provide a single rating and then ranked accordingly. Three distinct groupings became apparent: 16 organizations were rated at 3.6 (the mean of the 83 organizations) or higher; 24 organizations were rated at 3.0 - 3.5; and 11 organizations were rated at 2.8 or below.

Based on the clusters of ratings (with only one rating falling at 3.4, the next highest rating after 3.6 and six nominees ranked at 3.3), as well as time and funding allotted for NARF's review of exemplary programs, all but the top 16 programs in the above average group were eliminated from the working data base.

**4. Telephone Interviews**

Each respondent provided professional and business references as a part of the Phase 2 Screener data. A telephone interview was conducted with one professional and one business reference from each of the 16 programs.

A business reference was contacted and interviewed using open-ended questions relating to the following items on the Supported Employment Profile: quality of life regarding worksites, appropriateness of supports

on site, organizational structure of the facility, marketing presentation, and safeguards regarding supports on site and off. These items were used to capture the sense of commitment on the part of the employer, preparation of the employee, level of competence of the staff as perceived by the business community, and information concerning the general work environment.

The professional reference representing the largest consumer group serviced by the facility also was contacted and interviewed, using open-ended questions relative to the following items on the Supported Employment Profile: community and family acceptance of the program; job/worker match; and organizational structure in regards to attitude, planning, fiscal management, staff development, and marketing.

The information from each interview was rated as a positive (+) or negative (-) statement, with comments volunteered more than twice receiving an additional mark to weight the interview accordingly. Responses to standard interview questions were recorded and each interview received two independent ratings by NARF supported employment staff. One rating was based on the percentage of positive (+) statements and the second, separate rating was a ranking of overall impression using a 1-5 Linkert-type scale as before. For two facilities, additional interviews were conducted to attempt to resolve contradictions or gain missing information.

The two ratings for each reference were compared with the combined ratings from the Outcome Referenced Screener. Discrepancies were identified for four programs; however, no further data were obtained before the final evaluation.

**D. Final Evaluation and Determination of Sites**

All 16 programs were ranked separately for five different data collection instruments — the Outcome Referenced Screener, the Phase 2 Screener, the average of the references, and ratings for each reference. Programs rated above average in three out of five areas were then examined more closely. The average rankings were 3.8 for the Outcome Referenced Screener, 3.92 for the Phase 2 Screener, and 73.78 (out of 100 points) for the total ratings. (See also Tables 1 and 2.)

All programs were then compared with the demographics obtained in the original survey. All 16 were representative of the total respondents in terms of disability, supported employment model, and number of year's experience with supported employment. They were not representative of regions of the country, populations of the area, or staff size. Rather, the 16 programs were more representative of the east coast, larger metropolitan areas, and smaller staff size. Although no rural areas emerged, transportation difficulties in five sites were indicative of smaller areas with little or no public transportation systems.

After completion of all the analyses, eight programs continued to be ranked above average for all categories. These eight were compared with the survey demographics, plus information regarding consumer wages, and were

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF SURVEY
FINAL EVALUATION AND EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS

| Category | Percentage of Final Eight | Percentage of Nominees | Percentage of Total Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Region** | | | |
| Northeast | 46 | 25 | 23 |
| Southeast | 31 | 38 | 21 |
| Midwest | 15 | 12 | 34 |
| West | 8 | 25 | 21 |
| **Staff** | | | |
| 1-16 | 69 | 62 | 25 |
| 17-35 | 16 | 38 | 29 |
| 36-65 | — | — | 16 |
| 66 or more | 8 | 22 | 22 |
| **Area Population** | | | |
| 50,000 or less | 23 | — | 33 |
| Over 50,000 | 77 | 100 | 66 |
| **Type of Disability** | | | |
| Mental Retardation | 63 | 56 | |
| Traumatic Brain Injury | 13 | 3 | |
| Chronically Mentally Ill | | 13 | 9 |
| Other; Physical | | 25 | 18 |

CORRECTIONS TO TABLE 1

| | Percentage of Final Eight | Percentage of Nominees | Percentage of Total Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Area Population** | | | |
| 50,000 or less | 23* | Undetermined | 33 |
| Over 50,000 | 77* | Undetermined | 66 |
| **Type of Disability** | | | |
| Mental Retardation | ** | 63 | 56 |
| Traumatic Brain Injury | ** | 13 | 3 |
| Chronically Mentally Ill | | 13 | 9 |
| Other; Physical | | 25 | 18 |

* Population of city (or suburb) only. Data in Table 2, next page, reflects city (or suburb) and surrounding area.

** Primary Disability served is reported in Table 2, next page.

TABLE 2

EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS

| Region | Area[1] | #Years of Experience | # Supported Employees Placed | # of Staff | Dis.[2] | Model[3] | Wages[4] | Facility-Based? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SE | 50+* | 1.5 | 19 | 5 | MR | I,E | 4.75 | NO |
| NE | 50+ | 2.0 | 38 | 4 | CMI | I,WC | 5.13 | |
| SE | 50+* | 3.0 | 72 | 6 | MR | I | 4.20 | NO |
| SE | 50+ | 2.5 | 21 | 4 | MR | I | 3.95 | NO |
| NE | 50+ | 8.5 | 46 | 33 | AUT | I,E | 4.00 | NO |
| MW | 50+* | 1.5 | 20 | 3 | EPIL | I | 4.00 | NO |
| W | 50+* | 3.0 | 120 | 20 | MR | I,WC | 2.86 | |
| W | 50+* | 3.0 | 61 | 3 | MR | I,E,WC | 4.06 | |

CORRECTION TABLE 2

Entry # 3 (SE)....Facility-Based: YES

[1] Population in thousands. While each program was in an area of over 50,000, five of the programs (*) were on the outskirts of town and experienced transportation problems similar to rural areas.

[2] Refers to the following primary disabilities

MR = Mental Retardation
CMI = Chronic Mental Illness
AUT = Autism
EPIL = Epilepsy

[3] I = Individual Placement
WC = Work Crew
E = Enclave

[4] Average wages reported at the time of data collection with the Outcome Referenced Screener (January, 1989).

found to be representative in the same categories as the 16 programs. Four of the eight exemplary programs were non-facility based; three had active sheltered workshops, two of which were in the process of conversion; and one program also operated prevocational units as a part of the psychosocial program.

Each exemplary program director was contacted regarding his/her agency's selection and desire to participate further in the research program through a three-day site visit to explore program practices and management. All programs agreed to participate.

## SITE VISITS

### A. Overview

Early in the design process, NARF's Supported Employment Advisory Council determined that site visits could enhance the information obtained through the screening process by providing additional information on programs and verifying data reported earlier in the process. The site visits conducted at the eight sites selected as representative of exemplary practices were undertaken to gather information concerning: their organization — how they operated formally and informally; the rationale for providing supported employment; marketing and funding strategies; satisfaction on the part of providers, consumers and community; and quality of life as reported by the consumers.

The purpose of gathering this particular information was to determine the relationship between supported employment outcomes and actual practice. A secondary purpose was verification of the "quality indicators" of supported employment as determined from discussions with experts, research, and literature reviews.

Information was gathered through interviews, reviews of records and observations. Permission was obtained from William Allen to use "Looking at Quality in Supported Employment for People with Severe Disabilities" (1988) as a guide.

A three-person team conducted each 2 1/2 day site review. Each team consisted of: the NARF Project Director and/or Assistant Director, and one to two other professionals familiar with supported employment including: supported employment program managers or executive directors for agencies operating supported employment programs, former directors of two of the 27 state supported employment projects or their staff, a director of one of NARF's state chapters, the chair of NARF's Supported Employment Task Force, and a state vocational rehabilitation counselor. Directors of the 27 state model supported employment projects and members of NARF's Supported Employment Advisory Council assisted in recommending reviewers.

Site visits were designed to be as non-intrusive as possible. Additionally, it was stressed that these reviews were for a research project involved in gathering descriptive information and were neither to be operated as accreditation/certification reviews or to be considered as such.

**B. Agency Preparation**

Prior to each site visit, each agency updated current data regarding placements and prepared a tentative schedule for site visit interviews and work-site observations.

**C. Reviewer Orientation**

Each evaluator received a notebook containing the following information prior to the site review:

1. Completed Data. Copies of the agency's response to the NARF Supported Employment Survey, completed Phase 2 and Phase 3 Screeners, recorded responses to employer and professional telephone interviews, a confidentiality statement, the agency's scheduled agenda, and copies of correspondence from NARF to the agency in preparation for the review.

2. Data forms for conducting on-site observations, interviews, and record reviews. The Supported Employment Profile and copies of all interview forms (interview for the executive director, supported employment program staff, consumer, employer, and board members), and data summary forms.

   Once on site, the reviewer received an orientation regarding the intent and procedures of the review. The following items were stressed:

   a. On day one: The team is here to review a program that has been selected using a research/screening procedure based on outcomes. At this stage, the project is gathering descriptive information for use in a monograph to guide service providers in the rehabilitation field. The site review should not be confused with CARF or accreditation reviews which are for a different purpose and may follow different guidelines.

   b. The team must strive to understand the value system of the agency and attempt to dove-tail recommendations whenever possible.

   c. The project is aiming for a review that examines many facets of supported employment, one that is fairly comprehensive, and one that results in promotion and expansion of good practices, realizing at the same time that change is often incremental and that agencies can only manage a limited number of issues at any one time.

d. For record reviews, attempt to locate all the information requested. However, if the agency does not provide all the necessary forms, the team should proceed with the information provided, recording that the evaluation of some items is based upon limited information.

e. The project is evaluating the program from a "supported employment perspective" and other vocational concerns may be irrelevant to the evaluation.

**D. Program Presentations**

Each site visit began with an agency orientation session that lasted approximately 40-60 minutes. These sessions typically involved the executive director and management staff. Agencies were asked to present background information on their programs, program development and supported employment approaches, and marketing/PR information. Videotapes of the program were presented by many agencies.

**E. Staff, Employer, Professional, and Consumer Interviews**

Staff interviews involved executive level, management, and direct service staff. Sites using more than one model of employment required interviews with a variety of job coaching staff. Questions were developed from the Supported Employment Profile which facilitated gathering the appropriate information. Questions were repeated across staff as a means of confirming responses. Interviews were developed for the program executive, marketing/job developer, job coaches (individual, enclave and mobile crew supervisors), employers (on the job site), and professional references. Additional employer and professional interviews were conducted using the telephone interviews.

Consumers were interviewed regarding quality of life using one of four approaches: (1) the Quality of Life Interview (Schalock, 1988); (2) NARF's Modification of the Quality of Life Interview (NARF, 1989b) for individuals with limited verbal skills; (3) the Job Satisfaction Index (1975); or (4) portions of one of the above (in some cases the setting and/or production requirements did not facilitate lengthy consumer interviews). After all site reviews were completed, three sites were requested to complete the Job Satisfaction Index with five consumers in order that additional appropriate information on consumer satisfaction could be recorded and evaluated.

**F. Record Reviews**

Prior to the review, each agency was presented with a list of suggested documents that could be used to verify wages, hours, benefits, employers, organizational management, staff training and development, job coaching procedures, funding, interactions with parent, and marketing/job development. This list included such things as agency brochures, newsletters, board minutes, grant applications and approvals, letters of

agreement with funding sources, individual consumer files, and personnel manuals. Agencies determined which records they chose to share, with most agencies generously sharing information from a wide variety of sources.

**G. Preparation for the Exit Interview**

The site team synthesized information collected through individual interviews, review of records, and job site observations. Following completion of all interviews and record reviews, each reviewer transferred the data to the Supported Employment Profile and then to a summary form organizing data separately for each domain of the Supported Employment Profile into the following categories: Areas of Strength, Implications for Replications, Unique Aspects, and Next Steps.

The reviewers met prior to the exit interview and shared information, locating areas of agreement and any possible areas of contradictory information. Issues were discussed and the final presentation was planned.

**H. The Exit Interview**

The exit interview at each site proceeded according to the following sequence and guidelines:

1. Each exit interview should be planned to last about 1 1/2 hours.

2. First, present the background of reviewers, our qualifications and how our experiences, or lack there of, could bias the evaluation.

3. The review team leader describes NARF's Supported Employment Project, its history, and the objectives of the review.

4. The leader of the review team highlights outstanding characteristics of the program, listing and engaging in dialogue as appropriate.

5. Each reviewer makes positive comments about one of the agency's sites visited during the review, providing feedback on each site.

6. The individual topic areas from the Supported Employment Profile should be addressed separately, in sequence, with questions asked for clarification of areas of concern or discrepancy.

7. If the agency asks for suggestions or recommendations, the review team will proceed first with two or three priority recommendations being prepared to discuss each item for 5-10 minutes, suggest alternatives, and reinforce what the agency is doing well. This should be related to the Technical Assistance discussion (which follows), if appropriate.

8. The technical assistance aspects of the project will be described, including NARF's goal of matching agencies with concerns with the selected exemplary practices programs.

9. A brief discussion will follow concerning future contacts, including publication of the monograph and the agency's assistance with editing.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

## NARF'S SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT QUALITY INDICATORS PROFILE

November, 1989

The National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities
P.O. Box 17675
Washington, D.C. 20041
(703) 648-9300

NARF's Supported Employment Quality Indicators Profile was developed and refined by supported employment project staff with the assistance of the Supported Employment Advisory Council over a one-year period of time. The revised instrument is exhibited in Appendix B. The Supported Employment Quality Indicators Profile was intended to serve as a blueprint for evaluation of a variety of program data, including data to be obtained through self reporting, interviews, and site visits.

NARF's Supported Employment Quality Indicators Profile has been developed to review Supported Employment Programs which have been nominated as "exemplary programs or practices." The overall profile has served as a master list of characteristics which were reviewed through multiple processes, including use of an "Outcomes Referenced Screener", completion of NARF's Supported Employment Survey, telephone interviews, and site reviews. A final site review instrument also has been developed.

The Supported Employment Quality Indicators Profile was developed by examining numerous materials from organizations engaging in similar efforts. In developing this profile, we have found that certain items are common to any profile and therefore must naturally be included. NARF is grateful to Dr. Jan Nesbit and Michael Callahan, who have given NARF permission to incorporate a number of concepts and items from their document, "Assessing the Quality of Supported Employment Services", into this instrument.

Other evaluations, which were reviewed for development of this instrument, include:

### REFERENCES

Allen, B., Biggs, M., Sanford, J., Scavarda, M. & Scott, P. (1987) Quality Indicators in Supported Employment Programs: A Review System. Santa Rosa: Quality Assurance Committee.

Allen, W.T. (1988). Looking at quality in supported employment for people with severe disabilities: Quality outcome & process indicators. Unpublished manuscript, Developed with technical assistance from supported employment training sites and the University of San Francisco.

Backer, T.E. (1986). Validation Procedures for RRN Directory Innovations. Los Angeles, CA: Regulation Rehablitation Network.

Bellamy, G.T., Rhodes, L., Mank, D. & Albin, J. (1988). Supported employment: A community implementation guide. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Berkeley Planning Associates. (1986a). Development of performance measures for supported employment programs: Establishing consensus about recommended data items and developing a data collection strategy. Berkeley, CA: Author.

Berkeley Planning Associates. (1986b). Development of performance measures for supported employment programs, task 4 and 5: Availability of existing measures and need for additional measures to address program objectives. Berkeley, CA: Author.

Berkeley Planning Associates. (1986c). Development of performance measures for supported employment programs, task 6: Recommended measures for implementation plan. Berkeley, CA: Author.

Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities. (1989). Standards manual for organizations serving people with disabilities. Tucson, AZ: Author.

Mank, D. (1988). Supported employment model: Technical assistance assessment tool. Unpublished manuscript, University of Oregon, Eugene.

The Rehabilitation Network of New England. (1988). Quality indicators applicable to rehabilitation service delivery programs. Andover, MA: Author.

Schalock, R. (1988). Critical performance evaluation indicators in supported employment. In P. Wehman, & S. Moon (Eds.), Vocational rehabilitation and supported employment. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

The National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities
SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT QUALITY INDICATORS PROFILE

**Directions:**

**This instrument may be used either for internal self-evaluation or for peer review.**

**For the review, rate each item as "yes" or "no" according to evidence of meeting the criteria. Items followed by (unrated) are merely information items and may or may not be indicative of meeting quality criteria. The term "employee", unless otherwise indicated, refers to an employee with disabilities.**

## I. PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY AND VALUES

____ A) Examine mission, policy statements, and/or individual habilitation plans: Do they reflect a commitment to empowerment of persons with disabilities and to improving the overall lives of persons with disabilities?

____ B) Is there evidence of the agency publicly stating its commitment to integrated community employment and to quality outcomes (better pay, enhanced status) for persons with disabilities? Newspaper articles, other.

____ C) Is the agency actively seeking and securing community acceptance and promotion of community integrated employment, including supported employment? Ex.

____ D) Is the agency actively seeking and securing family understanding and support for community integrated employment, including supported employment? Ex.

____ E) Does the agency have a position statement which ensures the participation of applicants with severe disabilities (RSA statement)?

## II. QUALITY OF LIFE

A) Development of Quality Work Sites in the Community

____ 1) Do the jobs which have been developed represent the spectrum of businesses and employment opportunities within the local community?

____ 2) Are the employees fulfilling needed and valued functions through providing needed labor forces, contributing towards business and economic development, reducing turnover, increasing productivity or in other ways providing dependable services? Ex.

____ 3) Are the employees fully integrated into work settings (e.g., during work, breaks, lunch, and social interaction, and opportunities for supervision from non-program staff)? Ex. and areas which could be improved:

____ 4) Are the work schedules of employees typical of the industry?

____ 5) Do the jobs which have been developed include a range of positions, rather than including only entry level positions?

____ 6) Is the work setting safe, friendly, accessible and comfortable?[1]

____ 7) Are there opportunities and evidence of career advancement?

____ 8) Do the jobs targeted for development have a low rate of coworker and supervisor turnover?[1]

____ 9) Are jobs developed with adequate hours, benefits, and wages?

B) Interactions with Coworkers and Supervisors

____ 1) Are nondisabled coworkers and supervisors present at the work site during work shifts of employees?[1]

____ 2) Do opportunities exist for nonwork interactions with nondisabled coworkers?[1]

____ 3) Are interactions with nondisabled coworkers a part of routine job responsibilities?[1]

____ 4) For the individual placement model, do no more than two employees with disabilities work in the immediate work area?[1]

C) Employee Job Match

____ 1) Are jobs developed with the primary consideration of the skills, aptitudes and interests of the individual employee?

____ 2) Are individual placements made based on a match between the job and the assessment of the individual?

D) Empowerment

____ 1) Are employees enabled to make decisions through structured processes if appropriate and needed?

## III. APPROPRIATENESS OF SUPPORTS

A) Family & Community Support

____ 1) Does the agency provide as needed information and consultation to families on community alternatives inclusive of supported employment?

____ 2) Does the agency work in cooperation with residential providers/family to coordinate needed supports including residential, transportation and community experiences?

B) Assessment and Planning

____ 1) Does the assessment include:

- ____ vocational background?
- ____ job analysis?
- ____ analysis of individual preferences?
- ____ ecological work site analysis? (including interactions with coworkers, wages, and working conditions)
- ____ assessment of the match between the worker and the job characteristics?
- ____ assessment of family, residential and friendship supports?
- ____ job trainer to routines and responsibilities defined with and as needed by the employer?
- ____ social and communication skills requirements?
- ____ analysis of the individual's understanding of the work and expectations of the worker

____ 2) Does planning include:

- ____ plans for responsive intervention and work arrangements?
- ____ procedures for responsive interventions to problems which may arise at home or in the community? (scheduling, time/money usage)
- ____ consideration of other employment options including appropriate career planning?

____ 3) Does ongoing assessment include:

- ____ adequate measures of productivity, social skills, and work adjustment?
- ____ appropriate use of ecological inventories and job analysis?

F) Initial Training

____ 1) Are workers taught useful, productive and valued job skills?

____ 2) Are equipment or procedural modifications identified and implemented as necessary ?

____ 3) Are workers taught the necessary skills to travel to and from work?[1]

____ 4) Are breaks, lunch, time usage, social skills and other important functional skills a part of initial training?[1]

G) Use of Ongoing Supports

____ 1) Are placement, training and follow-along services provided according to individual needs with no standard time limits?[1]

____ 2) Does the intensity of support vary with job demands and individual needs?[1]

____ 3) Is the training and support provided the individual effective and appropriate?

____ 4) Are ongoing supports readily available and easily accessed?

____ 5) Are individual adaptations necessary for successful performance routinely developed (including: equipment modifications, augmentative communication systems, prosthetic devices, and modifications in tasks and procedures)?

____ 6) Is employee job satisfaction routinely monitored?

____ 7) When employees become dissatisfied with jobs, is consideration given to job changes, with new jobs identified and work changes made as appropriate to the individual situation?[1]

____ 8) Is reemployment assistance provided?[1]

## IV. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

A) Attitude and Planning

1) Does the attitude of the rehabilitation provider towards supported employment as evidenced in planning documents and interviews, demonstrate a spirit of:

____ a) innovation/dynamic orientation?
____ b) customer focus-consumer focus-employer focus?
____ c) cost/benefit concerns?

____ d) trust and openness to considering ideas from supported employment direct line staff?
____ e) ability to create quality supported employment?
____ f) inspiration and excitement over supported employment and quality of life for persons with disabilities?
____ g) open communication flow?
____ h) understanding of how demanding the supported employment workload can be and the programmatic implications?

____ 2) Is family/residential commitment secured prior to initiation of supported employment?[1]

____ 3) Is there an existing plan for continued supported employment, including changes in staffing patterns, resource reallocation, and specific timelines for implementation?

____ 4) Do plans focus on future innovations and improvements of services?

____ 5) Are systematic needs assessments of agency, community, and consumers needs being conducted?

____ 6) Are plans based on a systematic needs assessments?

____ 7) Are feedback, monitoring systems utilized for implementing and evaluating change?

C) Organizational stability/capacity

1) How long has the organization been involved with supported employment? _____ yrs. _____ mos. (unrated)

____ 2) Does the organization have access to adequate resources, operating capital, services, etc?

____ 3) Do budget projections indicate capacity to continue providing a high quality supported employment program?

____ 4) Is the family represented on the governing Board?[1]

____ 5) Is the consumer represented on the governing Board?[1]

____ 6) Are business and industry represented on the governing Board?[1]

____ 7) Does the governing Board review the supported employment progress several times during the year?[1]

8) Has financial support been secured from several available sources? (unrated)

a) MR/DD, VR, JTPA, MH _____
b) 1619(a) and (b), and SGA _____

D) Fiscal Management

____ 1) Are allocations made for staff development and training?[1]

____ 2) Do plans for securing revenue include modifications in the use of existing resources?

3) Are a range of payment options available, including sub-minimum wage certificates? (unrated) _____

____ 4) Has the agency developed a costing system which reflects actual costs to ensure a system for the ongoing development of supported employment (this could include the use of payments from employers and others)?

5) What is the indirect charged to supported employment? (unrated)_____

E) Marketing and Public Relations

____ 1) Does the marketing plan have specific objectives related to outcomes for supported employees?[1]

____ 2) Does the marketing plan identify strategies, staff responsible for implementation and resources needed?[1]

____ 3) Are agency staff knowledgeable about current employment opportunities in the community?[1]

____ 4) Has marketing included presentations to schools, community groups, businesses, and parents?

____ 5) Do the agency and its staff demonstrate professionalism in the promotion and marketing of supported employment?

____ 6) Has the agency developed networks with employers and employer groups for referrals, information sharing, and program development?

F) Staff Development and Personnel Management

____ 1) Is staffing for supported employment adequate and effective?

____ 2) Where teams are used, is coordination sufficient and are the teams effective?

____ 3) Is scheduling adequate to meet the needs of employees both for initial training and follow-along services?

____ 4) Does training for supported employment enable staff to be effective?

____ 5) Do supported employment staff indicate feelings of job satisfaction (e.g., being challenged, being autonomous)?

____ 6) Does the environment facilitate creative problem solving and innovation?

____ 7) Do supported employment staff indicate satisfaction with the competence of the supervision they receive?

____ 8) Do staff indicate a sense of pride in their accomplishments and feelings of being valued, with reasonable rewards for effective work? Do the values held for supported employees permeate the supported employment program?

9) What is the turnover rate for supported employment staff within the past year?_____ (unrated).

G) Coordination with School and Community Programs

1) Has the agency coordinated services with local school programs, including planning and delivering transitional services?_____ (unrated)

____ 3) Have relationships with job providing agencies such as vocational rehabilitation services, job services, community developmental services, and JTPA been developed?[1]

____ 4) Have technical assistance support relationships been established?[1]

____ 5) Are family and home supports used to facilitate employment (e.g., transportation, job development and training)?[1]

H) Employers Involvement

____ 1) Has a business/industry advisory board been formed?

____ 2) Do employers indicate satisfaction with the services provided by the coordinating/supervising agency?

____ 3) Are the employers involved in the evaluation of worker's performance?[1]

____ 4) Do employers provide feedback on supported employment procedures and trainer's roles?[1]

____ 5) Are presentations on supported employment to local employers and civic groups an on-going component of the service?

____ 6) Do employers provide referrals for developing new supported employment opportunities?

____ 7) Do employers indicate that supported employment staff are responsible, responsive, and effective?

____ 8) Do employers contribute through their attitude and actions to an environment which enhances the quality of work and quality of life of the supported employee?

____ 9) Are proper procedures for securing regular sub-minimum wages documented and used?

___ 10) Are commensurate and/or minimum wages sought before considering sub-minimum wages?

___ 11) Are employers involved in decisions concerning job and equipment modifications?

## V. SAFEGUARDS

____ 1) Do supported employment plans and procedures provide evidence of procedures to reduce risk to supported employees, including:

a) consideration of effect on SSI, SSDI benefits?
b) plans for decisive and effective action when difficulties arise?
c) plans for "fallback" for ineffective or inappropriate placements?

____ 2) Does the agency engage in preventive action, including: environmental assessment, community-referenced skills assessment, and good employee-job matches?

____ 3) Are parents and prospective supported employees adequately prepared for and involved in supported employment placements (e.g., records of meetings held, evidence of preference)?

____ 4) Are supported employment placements made with effective planning of transportation and procedures for handling possible emergencies?

____ 5) Are backups for transportation and direct training supervision documented?

____ 6) Is on-site support provided in a sensitive and non-intrusive way to minimize stigmatization?

____ 7) Are staff adequately trained and paid?

____ 8) Does staff demonstrate competence (individual placement specialists are enthusiastic, energetic, good communicators, technically skilled, and effective coordinators and problem solvers)?

____ 9) Are instructional and supplementary interventions (e.g., for transportation, health, and ancillary needs) responsive, timely, and effective?

___ 10) Is supported employee turnover indicative of desire to advance or try other employment and does not reflect low quality job matches, staff deficiencies or agency incompetence? (Examine rate of turnover as well as stated reasons.)

___ 11) Is placement into supported employment made with consideration of trends in unemployment rates, work force needs, and prediction of the stability of the local economy?

___ 12) Is there evidence that the program reviews itself critically in terms of quality control?

## ADDITIONAL ITEMS

Additional items from the April 1989 DRAFT of NARF's Supported Employment Profile, are included below. These items may be relevant to supported employment outcomes; however, during our trial use of this instrument with the eight "exemplary practices" sites, more than 1/2 the sites reviewed did not follow these practices. Some of these may be second generation issues and are just now beginning to be addressed. Other items may be relevant but not noticed due to the lack of a related criteria in selection of the eight sites. Other items may be unrelated to supported employment outcomes.

A) Quality of Life

____ 1) Are group based employment situations integrated with 8 or fewer persons with disabilities?

____ 2) Is assistance with money management provided for shopping, banking, and community participation in recreational/leisure activities?[1]

____ 3) Are employers, coworkers and others involved in providing long-term supports?[1]

____ 4) Is assistance provided in maintaining existing friendships as well as the development of new social relationships?

____ 5) Do employees have and use opportunities to make informed choices at work and in the community?

____ 6) Do employees have and use opportunities to participate in a normal range of community activities?

____ 7) Do employees have personal discretion over the use of compensation received from work?

____ 8) Does the employee have control over his/her environment? (Consider: meals, medications, pets, friends visiting within one's home, coming and going, recreational/leisure activities, and basic routines/time usage). Evidence:

B) The Agency's ability to manage changes associated with Supported Employment

____ 1) Are the supported employment programs and the agencies, in terms of change processes, effectively managing necessary changes brought about by supported employment? (The company may be in stages of initial awareness, visionary beginnings, second stage challenges to authority and conflict, third stage resolution of conflict, fourth stage intergroup conflict, fifth stage quasi-stationary equilibrium, or sixth stage program refinement.)

____ 2) Are conflicts and discomfort associated with change openly recognized?

____ 3) Are conflict resolutions occurring in a manner which improves and supports the Supported Employment process?

____ 4) Does conflict resolution include the process of technical assistance and open communications?

C) Fiscal Management

____ 1) Can discrete costs associated with specific employment services, i.e., job development, placement, training and follow-along be identified?

____ 2) Is it possible to track costs for supporting each individual in employment?

____ 3) Have additional forms of revenue for the agency and support services (e.g., employer participation) been explored?[1]

____ 4) Have long-term funding issues been addressed in the plan?

____ 5) Are administrative costs proportionate to the number of clients being served?[1]

6) Does the agency allocate administrative costs to supported employment? (unrated)_____ How:

_____

D) Staff

____ 1) Do supported employment staff take part in setting supported employment program goals?

2) Has the agency provided schools with feedback concerning the outcomes and status of graduates?
_____ (unrated).[1]

____ 3) Is coordination provided to maximize each individual's financial benefits (e.g., pay, SSI, SSDI, employer insurance)?[1]

____ 4) Are job developers providing assistance to employers in securing TJTC?

____ 5) Is fading of supervision correctly timed, implemented and documented through performance records?

____ 6) Does the work environment include arrangement for supports from coworkers and supervisors?

E) Other

____ 1) Is a Management Information System (MIS) used to manage the supported employment program?

____ 2) Are employers willing to allocate resources to assist with implementation of supported employment?

_____

[1] From "Assessing the Quality of Supported Employment Services" by J. Nisbet and M. Callahan, 1989, Durham, NH: The Institute on Disability, University of New Hampshire. Adapted with permission of the authors.

APPENDIX C

ASETS

AUXILIARY CONSUMER EVALUATION FOR STAFF

V.C.

Staff Member:_____ Date:_____

Please rate each question using the following scale:

7 - Completely Satisfied
6 - Satisfied
5 - Slightly Satisfied
4 - Neutral
3 - Slightly Dissatisfied
2 - Dissatisfied
1 - Completely Dissatisfied

1. Are you satisfied that he/she understands and is sensitive to the demands of your job?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Are you satisfied that he/she views you as an equally important and valued team member at the worksite?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Are you satisfied that he/she is aware of and follows up on your concerns in a timely manner?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Are you satisfied that he/she knows the solutions to most of the problems of your job?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Are you satisfied that he/she views you as a primary consumer of their services?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Are you satisfied with the amount and helpfulness of feedback he/she has given you?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Are you satisfied that he/she is receptive to your ideas and suggestions in solving problems?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Are you satisfied that you can contact him/her when you need to?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Are you satisfied that you are treated fairly and with respect by him/her?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Are you satisfied that you are free to discuss your feelings about your job with him/her?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

This staff member is best at:_____

This staff member needs to improve in:_____

Other Comments:_____

## SUPERVISOR'S CONSUMER EVALUATION FOR STAFF* V.A.

STAFF NAME:_____

POSITION:

____Teaching Manager

____Associate Teaching Manager

____Vocational Trainer I

____Vocational Trainer II

____Vocational Trainer III

____Vocational Trainer IV

RATING SCALE:

7 - Completely Satisfied

6 - Satisfied

5 - Slightly Satisfied

4 - Neutral

3 - Slightly Dissatisfied

2 - Dissatisfied

1 - Completely Dissatisfied

---

1. Are you satisfied with the pleasantness of the interactions you have had with the above named staff member?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

2. Are you satisfied with the amount of cooperation you have received from this staff member's interactions with you?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

3. Are you satisfied that this staff member is doing an effective job in handling situations when you are not present?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

*ASETS (1989)

4. Are you satisfied with the professionalism of this staff member's behavior (i.e. in his/her appearance, conduct of the workers/ residents, etc.)?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Are you satisfied with the amount of commitment and flexibility expended by the staff member in the support of your program?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Are you satisfied that the staff member is carrying out the established treatment program?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Are you satisfied that the staff member facilitates teamwork in your program (cooperation with other staff, site employees, ancillary agencies; gives and receives feedback with team members frequently and proactively)?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Are you satisfied that the staff responds to outside agency critical feedback professionally (resolves problem, positive attitude, timeliness, follow-up, etc.)?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Are you satisfied with the quality and timeliness of the staff member's written work (IHP, personnel, EEO, worksite contracts, budgetary, etc.)?

Rating:_____ Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

This staff member's strengths are:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

This staff member's areas for improvement are:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

Supervisor's Signature Date

*ASETS (1989)

CLIENT: _____

OBJECTIVE: _____

_____

WORKSITE: _____

TASK: _____

## SOCIAL SKILLS DATA SHEET*

C = CORRECT AND INDEPENDENT
P = CORRECT WITH PROMPT
O = INCORRECT OR NO RESPONSE

RECORD ONLY ONE ROLE-PLAY OR ACTUAL SITUATION ON EACH LINE.

| DATE | TIME | ROLE PLAY | ACTUAL SITUATION | COMMENTS | INITIALS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

*From CSAAC (Smith: 1988).

National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities
P.O. Box 17675
Washington, D.C. 20041
(703) 648-9300